

The Signs of the Times, vol. 11

ESR

Ellet Joseph Waggoner

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Table of Contents | 2 |
| 1885 | 6 |
| January 1, 1885 | 6 |
| "Punishment of the Wicked" The Signs of the Times, 11, 1. | 6 |
| LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—JAN. 17 | 6 |
| "Fate of the Wicked" The Signs of the Times, 11, 1. | 9 |
| LESSON FROM THE JEWISH SACRIFICES | 10 |
| "The Lord's Supper and the Laying On of Hands" The Signs of the Times, 11, 1. | 13 |
| THE LORD'S SUPPER | 14 |
| LAYING ON OF HANDS | 16 |
| January 8, 1885 | 18 |
| "The Sabbath-School" The Signs of the Times, 11, 2. | 18 |
| LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—JAN. 24 | 18 |
| "False Witness" The Signs of the Times, 11, 2. | 22 |
| January 15, 1885 | 25 |
| "Punishment of the Wicked—Continued" The Signs of the Times, 11, 3. | 25 |
| LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—JAN. 31 | 25 |
| "A Puzzled Correspondent" The Signs of the Times, 11, 3. | 28 |
| "Easy Conversion" The Signs of the Times, 11, 3. | 33 |
| "'Christian Consciousness' vs. the Bible" The Signs of the Times, 11, 3. | 35 |
| "The Work in Healdsburg" The Signs of the Times, 11, 3. | 36 |
| January 22, 1885 | 37 |
| "Punishment of the Wicked—Continued" The Signs of the Times, 11, 4. | 37 |
| LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—FEB. 21 | 37 |
| "Will Worship, and No Worship" The Signs of the Times, 11, 4. | 41 |
| January 29, 1885 | 45 |
| "Punishment of the Wicked—Continued" The Signs of the Times, 11, 5. | 45 |
| LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—FEB. 28 | 45 |
| "How It Was Done, and Why" The Signs of the Times, 11, 5. | 49 |
| February 5, 1885 | 54 |
| "Punishment of the Wicked—Review" The Signs of the Times, 11, 6. | 54 |
| LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—MARCH 7 | 54 |
| "Vice As an Aid to Virtue" The Signs of the Times, 11, 6. | 58 |
| February 12, 1885 | 62 |
| "The Inheritance of the Saints" The Signs of the Times, 11, 7. | 62 |
| LESSON FOR TH PACIFIC COAST—MARCH 14 | 62 |
| February 26, 1885 | 67 |
| "Inheritance of the Saints.—Continued" The Signs of the Times, 11, 9. | 67 |
| LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—MARCH 28 | 67 |
| THE FIRST DOMINION FORFEITED | 67 |
| "Mercy and Justice" The Signs of the Times, 11, 9. | 70 |
| March 19, 1885 | 79 |
| "Inheritance of the Saints" The Signs of the Times, 11, 2. | 79 |
| LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—APRIL 21 | 79 |
| March 26, 1885 | 83 |
| "Inheritance of the Saints. Promises to Abraham" The Signs of the Times, 11, 13. | 83 |
| LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—APRIL 15 | 83 |
| PROMISES TO ABRAHAM | 83 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| April 2, 1885 | 86 |
| “Inheritance of the Saints. Promises to Abraham.—Continued” The Signs of the Times, | |
| 11, 14. | 86 |
| LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—MAY 2 | 86 |
| PROMISES TO ABRAHAM.—CONTINUED | 86 |
| April 9, 1885 | 89 |
| “Inheritance of the Saints. Promises to Abraham.—Continued” The Signs of the Times, | |
| 11, 15. | 89 |
| LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—MAY 9 | 89 |
| PROMISES TO ABRAHAM.—CONTINUED | 89 |
| April 16, 1885 | 93 |
| “Inheritance of the Saints. Promises to Abraham.—Continued” The Signs of the Times, | |
| 11, 16. | 93 |
| LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—MAY 16 | 93 |
| PROMISES TO ABRAHAM.—CONTINUED | 93 |
| May 7, 1885 | 97 |
| “College Notes” The Signs of the Times, 11, 19. | 97 |
| June 4, 1885 | 100 |
| “Inheritance of the Saints. (Continued.)” The Signs of the Times, 11, 22. | 100 |
| LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—JULY 4 | 100 |
| SOJOURNING IN A STRANGE LAND | 100 |
| June 11, 1885 | 105 |
| “Inheritance of the Saints. (Continued.) The Promised Land” The Signs of the Times, 11, | |
| 23. | 105 |
| LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—JULY 11 | 105 |
| THE PROMISED LAND | 105 |
| “‘How Readest Thou?’” The Signs of the Times, 11, 23. | 108 |
| June 18, 1885 | 112 |
| “Inheritance of the Saints. Continued. An Earthly King Chosen” The Signs of the Times, | |
| 11, 24. | 112 |
| LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—JULY 18 | 112 |
| AN EARTHLY KING CHOSEN | 112 |
| “Thoughts on the Third Psalm” The Signs of the Times, 11, 24. | 115 |
| June 25, 1885 | 120 |
| “Inheritance of the Saints. Continued. Rejection of Saul as King of Israel” The Signs of | |
| the Times, 11, 25. | 120 |
| LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—JULY 25 | 120 |
| REJECTION OF SAUL AS KING OF ISRAEL | 120 |
| “Upper Columbia Camp-Meeting” The Signs of the Times, 11, 25. | 123 |
| July 2, 1885 | 125 |
| “Inheritance of the Saints. Continued. The Promise to David” The Signs of the Times, 11, | |
| 26. | 125 |
| LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—AUG 1 | 125 |
| THE PROMISE TO DAVID | 125 |
| July 16, 1885 | 128 |
| “Inheritance of the Saints. Continued. Promise Concerning the Kingdom of Israel” The | |
| Signs of the Times, 11, 27. | 128 |
| LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—AUG. 8 | 128 |
| PROMISE CONCERNING THE KINGDOM OF ISRAEL | 128 |
| “Camp-Meeting in Portland, Oregon” The Signs of the Times, 11, 27. | 130 |
| “The Sabbath in Eden” The Signs of the Times, 11, 27. | 132 |
| July 23, 1885 | 138 |
| “Human Ignorance vs. Divine Knowledge” The Signs of the Times, 11, 28. | 138 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| July 30, 1885 | 142 |
| “The Sabbath at the Exode” The Signs of the Times, 11, 30. | 142 |
| August 6, 1885 | 146 |
| “No Probation after Death” The Signs of the Times, 11, 30. | 146 |
| August 13, 1885 | 151 |
| “The Sabbath of the Decalogue” The Signs of the Times, 11, 31. | 151 |
| “Who Was Melchizedek?” The Signs of the Times, 11, 31. | 154 |
| August 20, 1885 | 158 |
| “The Sabbath a Sign” The Signs of the Times, 11, 32. | 158 |
| August 27, 1885 | 162 |
| “Sabbath and Sunday” The Signs of the Times, 11, 33. | 162 |
| “Handling the Word Deceitfully” The Signs of the Times, 11, 33. | 165 |
| September 3, 1885 | 168 |
| “Bondage and Freedom” The Signs of the Times, 11, 34. | 168 |
| September 10, 1885 | 172 |
| “Nebuchadnezzar’s Dream” The Signs of the Times, 11, 35. | 172 |
| LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—OCT. 8 | 172 |
| “Whom Shall We Obey?” The Signs of the Times, 11, 35. | 178 |
| September 17, 1885 | 182 |
| “The Four Kingdoms” The Signs of the Times, 11, 36. | 182 |
| LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—OCT. 10 | 182 |
| THE FOUR KINGDOMS | 182 |
| “Another ‘Check’ Wanted” The Signs of the Times, 11, 36. | 188 |
| “Death and the Coming of the Lord” The Signs of the Times, 11, 36. | 189 |
| October 1, 1885 | 196 |
| “The Four Kingdoms of Daniel 7” The Signs of the Times, 11, 37. | 196 |
| “The Lord’s Sabbath Definite” The Signs of the Times, 11, 37. | 200 |
| October 8, 1885 | 204 |
| “The Sure Foundation” The Signs of the Times, 11, 38. | 204 |
| October 15, 1885 | 212 |
| “Tributes to the Bible” The Signs of the Times, 11, 39. | 212 |
| “One Cause of Unbelief” The Signs of the Times, 11, 39. | 213 |
| October 22, 1885 | 216 |
| “Some Facts about Roman Catholicism” The Signs of the Times, 11, 40. | 216 |
| October 29, 1885 | 224 |
| “The Fourth Kingdom” The Signs of the Times, 11, 41. | 224 |
| LESSONS FOR PACIFIC COAST—NOV. 14 AND 21 | 224 |
| The Fourth Kingdom | 224 |
| “From Adam to Moses” The Signs of the Times, 11, 41. | 228 |
| “Paul and the Revision Committee” The Signs of the Times, 11, 41. | 230 |
| November 5, 1885 | 233 |
| “The Little Horn of Daniel 7” The Signs of the Times, 11, 42. | 233 |
| LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—NOV. 23 | 233 |
| The Little Horn of Daniel 7 | 233 |
| “What Is the Use?” The Signs of the Times, 11, 42. | 240 |
| “The Best Argument for Sunday” The Signs of the Times, 11, 42. | 246 |
| “Where Shall the Line Be Drawn” The Signs of the Times, 11, 42. | 247 |
| November 12, 1885 | 250 |
| “The 1260 Days” The Signs of the Times, 11, 43. | 250 |
| LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—DEC. 5 | 250 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| The 1260 Days | 250 |
| "Which Is Evangelical?" The Signs of the Times, 11, 43. | 255 |
| November 19, 1885 | 260 |
| "The Little Horn of Daniel 8" The Signs of the Times, 11, 44. | 260 |
| LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—DEC. 12 | 260 |
| The Little Horn of Daniel 8 | 260 |
| "Making Trouble" The Signs of the Times, 11, 44. | 265 |
| "'Numerical Designation' in the Sabbath Commandment" The Signs of the Times, 11, 44. | 270 |
| "How It May Be Done" The Signs of the Times, 11, 44. | 268 |
| November 26, 1885 | 273 |
| "Pagan and Papal Rome" The Signs of the Times, 11, 45. | 273 |
| "Judged by the Law" The Signs of the Times, 11, 45. | 279 |
| "Shifting Responsibility" The Signs of the Times, 11, 45. | 285 |
| December 3, 1885 | 287 |
| "Vain Customs" The Signs of the Times, 11, 46. | 287 |
| "Comments on Psalm 15" The Signs of the Times, 11, 46. | 289 |
| December 10, 1885 | 295 |
| "Sabbath-School Notes" The Signs of the Times, 11, 47. | 295 |
| LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—JAN. 2 | 295 |
| Sabbath-School Notes | 295 |
| December 17, 1885 | 302 |
| "The Everlasting Kingdom" The Signs of the Times, 11, 48. | 302 |
| LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—JAN. 9 | 302 |
| The Everlasting Kingdom | 302 |
| "Principles and Precepts" The Signs of the Times, 11, 48. | 309 |
| "The High-License Delusion" The Signs of the Times, 11, 48. | 313 |
| December 24, 1885 | 317 |
| "The Law of God-for Whom Made" The Signs of the Times, 11, 49. | 317 |
| "How Does It Happen" The Signs of the Times, 11, 49. | 319 |

1885

January 1, 1885

“Punishment of the Wicked” *The Signs of the Times*, 11, 1.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—JAN. 17

1. How many classes of people does the Bible recognize as existing in the world? *Matthew 13:24, 25.SITI January 1, 1885, page 6.1*
2. What are these classes? *Verse 38.SITI January 1, 1885, page 6.2*
3. How long do they remain mingled together? *Verses 28-30.SITI January 1, 1885, page 6.3*
4. When is the harvest? *Verse 39.SITI January 1, 1885, page 6.4*
5. Is there any class between these two? *Matthew 12:30.SITI January 1, 1885, page 6.5*
6. Can one be in both these classes at the same time? *Matthew 6:24.SITI January 1, 1885, page 6.6*
7. When will the separation between these two classes be made? *Matthew 25:31-33.SITI January 1, 1885, page 6.7*
8. Briefly describe the character of these two classes? *Verses 34-45.SITI January 1, 1885, page 6.8*
9. What will finally become of them both? *Verse 46.SITI January 1, 1885, page 6.9*
10. When it is said that the righteous shall go into “life eternal,” what is meant? *Luke 20:35, 36.SITI January 1, 1885, page 6.10*

11. Define the words “everlasting” and “eternal.” *SITI January 1, 1885, page 6.11*

12. How much difference in duration will there be between the reward of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked? *Matthew 25:46.SITI January 1, 1885, page 6.12*

13. What is to be punished with the wicked? *Romans 6:23.SITI January 1, 1885, page 6.13*

14. Since their punishment is to be everlasting, or eternal, what can you say of the death which is the wages of sin? *SITI January 1, 1885, page 6.14*

15. What is said of the punishment of those who do not obey the gospel? *2 Thessalonians 1:7-9.SITI January 1, 1885, page 6.15*

16. From whom does the apostle say the everlasting destruction comes? *SITI January 1, 1885, page 6.16*

17. What is it that comes from God and destroys the wicked? *Revelation 22:9.SITI January 1, 1885, page 6.17*

18. Will any wicked person escape the wrath of God? *Nahum 1:3.SITI January 1, 1885, page 6.18*

19. How many of earth’s inhabitants have never sinned? *Romans 3:23.SITI January 1, 1885, page 6.19*

20. Then how will it be possible for anybody to escape eternal death? *1 John 1:7.SITI January 1, 1885, page 6.20*

There are innumerable classes of people in the world, according to a human reckoning, but according to God’s standard-the Bible-there are only two. These are the righteous and the wicked. God made man upright, and designed that he should remain so; but the enemy came in and marred the handywork of the Creator. Since the fall of Adam there has not been a time when there have not been wicked persons on the earth. Indeed, so great has been the contamination that there has been no man since that time who was not to a greater or lesser extent a sinner. It is evident, then, that if at that

time the tares-the wicked of earth-had it been plucked up, there would have been no wheat left. Both are to grow together until the harvest-the end of the world. Then a separation will be made by the only one who is able to distinguish between the good grain and the worthless matter. *SITI January 1, 1885, page 6.21*

From these facts two things are evident. 1. There are only two classes. Christ said: "He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad." *Matthew 12:30*. There is no provision made for people who are "as good as the average." To be only as good as the average of mankind, is to be very bad. The standard is *good*. Anything different from that is bad. 2. None receive the reward until the Lord comes. In the end of the world-the harvest-the master sends for his angels, and they "sever the wicked *from among* the just." The farmer does not reap one portion of his wheat-field in the spring, another in midsummer. And still another in the fall. There is a special harvest-time, and then all his grain is reaped. So the Lord has not been all the time gathering from this field that he has sown, but has "appointed a day in the which he will judge the world." "The harvest is the *end* of the world," not the beginning, middle, and end. *SITI January 1, 1885, page 6.22*

From *Matthew 25:35-45* we learn that the Lord weighs not only *actions* but intentions. Those to whom the king says, "Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom," etc., have not an opinion of their merit. They have had such exalted ideas of right that their humble deeds seem as nothing in comparison. But love to Christ is the mainspring of all their action, and that glorifies every deed however small. Christ identifies himself with his people so closely that whatever is done to them is accounted as done directly to him. On the other hand, we learn that no act, however worthy in itself, is of any value in the sight of God unless done for love to Christ. The heathen did many good things. Their philosophers taught what they called "virtue," some things in which were really good. But all their boasted virtue was only for the exaltation of self. Selfishness was the motive that prompted all their deeds; and since a fountain cannot send the forth at the same time both sweet water and bitter, neither can a good accompany evil, it follows that even their seeming good deeds were really evil. On this same basis, whatever is done "*In order* that we may have eternal life," with the

idea that good deeds are going to make one worthy of reward, is all in vain. Love must be the ruling motive. If we serve God because of gratitude to him for his love that has already been manifested to us, his love will be still further manifested in *giving* us eternal life. His love will always be as much greater than ours as he is greater than we; consequently the utmost efforts that our love can prompt will fall infinitely short of compensating for his benefits to us. *SITI January 1, 1885, page 6.23*

“And these [the wicked] shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life the eternal.” *Matthew 25:46*. The words of “eternal” and “everlasting” are from the same word in the original, and mean the same. We know that in this case they mean “without end,” for Christ tells us that those who obtain that world, cannot die anymore (*Luke 20:35, 36*); hence eternal life means life without end. Then eternal or everlasting punishment means punishment without end. This will be the fate of the wicked. But mark; this verse; does not tell the *nature* of the punishment; only tells us that the punishment will be inflicted, and that it will last eternally. *Romans 6:23* tells us what the punishment is to be: “The wages of sin is death.” Then *Matthew 25:46* might very properly be paraphrased thus: “And these-wicked-shall go away into eternal death; but the righteous into eternal life.” This is exactly what the text teaches. In harmony with this Paul says of those who know not God, and do not obey the gospel, that they “shall be punished with *everlasting destruction*.” This cannot be the case if they are never *destroyed*. The agent of this destruction is to be fire, which is to come “from the presence of the Lord.” See 2 *Thessalonians 2:8*; *Revelation 20:9*. *SITI January 1, 1885, page 6.24*

“The Lord is slow to anger, and great in power, and will not at all acquit the wicked.” *Nahum 1:3*. No guilty person can escape the wrath of God. How then can anybody escape eternal death, since “all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God”? Only by having their guilt taken away by the blood of the Lamb of God. If we do not come to Christ, we can never have life; but if he is “made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification,” he will also be unto us “redemption.” E. J. W. *SITI January 1, 1885, page 6.25*

“Fate of the Wicked” The Signs of the Times, 11, 1.

LESSON FROM THE JEWISH SACRIFICES

The prophet David had in his lifetime an experience similar to that of many others. That to which we refer is recorded in the seventy-third psalm. He thought things were very unequally and unjustly divided. He saw that the wicked were as a rule in better circumstances than the righteous; and in contemplating this, he came very near making shipwreck of this faith. Said he: "But as for me, my feet were almost gone; my steps had well nigh slipped. For I was envious at the foolish, when I saw the prosperity of the wicked. For there are no bands in their death; but their strength is firm. They [are] not in trouble as other men; neither are they plagued like other men.... Their eyes stand out with fatness: they have more than heart could wish. They are corrupt, and speak wickedly concerning oppression; they speak loftily. They set their mouth against the heavens, and their tongue walketh through the earth.... And they say, How doth God know? and is there knowledge in the most High? Behold, these are the ungodly, who prosper in the world; they increase in riches." *Verses 2-12. SITI January 1, 1885, page 8.1*

As he contrasted his condition with theirs, he concluded that the service of the Lord didn't pay. His words were: "Verily I have cleansed my heart in vain, and washed my hands in innocency. For all the day long have I been plagued, and chastened every morning." *Verses 13, 14.* How many people we have heard reason in the same way. "If God is just," they say, "why does he allow Mr. A, who is a humble, devoted Christian, to suffer so much of poverty and sickness, while Mr. B, his blasphemous neighbor, has an abundance of everything, with nothing to trouble him?" It is short-sighted reasoning, as David himself found out, although not from his own reasoning as to what God ought to do. He continues: "When I thought to know this, it was too painful for me; until I went into the sanctuary of God; then understood I their end. Surely thou didst set them in slippery places: thou castedst them down into destruction. How are they brought into desolation, as in a moment! they are utterly consumed with terrors. As a dream when one awaketh; so, O Lord, when thou awakest, thou shalt despise their

image.” *Verses 16-20.SITI January 1, 1885, page 8.2*

In these verses we find a striking confirmation of the texts which have before been quoted as proving the final utter extinction of the wicked. Their present security is only apparent, not real; they are in slippery places, and are to be cast down to destruction. As in a moment they are to be brought into desolation. More than this, when the Lord arises to take vengeance on his adversaries, they are to be as a dream when one awakes from sleep-vanished into nothingness. As elsewhere expressed, they are to be “as the early dew that passeth away.”*SITI January 1, 1885, page 8.3*

All this the psalmist found out when he went into the sanctuary of the Lord. Let us then, go in with him, and see for ourselves what is there taught concerning the fate of the wicked. It is evident that we must consider that part of the sanctuary service which has to do with sin, if we are to learn anything concerning the end of the wicked. This service is given somewhat at length in the fourth chapter of Leviticus. We will quote enough of the chapter to bring the matter directly before us:-*SITI January 1, 1885, page 8.4*

“And if any one of the common people sin through ignorance, while he doeth somewhat against any of the commandments of the Lord concerning things which ought not to be done, and be guilty; or if his sin, which he hath sinned, come to his knowledge: then he shall bring his offering, a kid of the goats, a female without blemish, for his sin which he hath sinned. And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the sin offering, and slay the sin offering in the place of the burnt offering. And the priest shall take of the blood thereof with his finger, and put it upon the horns of the altar of burnt offering, and shall pour out all the blood thereof at the bottom of the altar. And he shall take away all the fat thereof, as the fat is taken away from off the sacrifice of peace offerings; and the priest shall burn it upon the altar for a sweet savour unto the Lord; and the priest shall make an atonement for him, and it shall be forgiven him.” *Leviticus 4:27-31.SITI January 1, 1885, page 8.5*

With some modifications, of a minor character, this was the ceremony to be performed when sin had been committed. The victim to be offered might be a bullock, a goat, a lamb, or a pidgeon,

according to the rank or wealth of the sinner, the poor not being required to bring so costly an offering as the wealthy. But in all the principle was the same, and that principle is so simple that a child can easily grasp it. The sinner, by laying his hands upon the head of the offering, transferred, in figure, his sins to the victim, which represented Christ, "who his own self bear our sins in his own body on the tree." *1 Peter 2:24*. The offering having thus, in figure, received the sins of the transgressors, was slain, thus prefiguring Christ, who was "delivered for our offenses," and who "died for the ungodly." When this was done and the blood or flesh of the victim had been carried into the sanctuary, the man's sins were forgiven him. If he remained penitent until the day of atonement, his sins were blotted out entirely when the sanctuary was cleansed. *Leviticus 17*. In all this reference was had to Christ, who "appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." *SITI January 1, 1885, page 9.1*

As a victim, when it had in figure received the sins of the transgressor, was slain, so Christ, when the Lord had laid on him the iniquity of the all, "poured out his soul unto death." He died for us, "the just for the unjust;" thus showing what would be man's fate had the offering not been made, or should he not accept it. And so, in the figure, the penitent Jew, as the victim bearing his sin was slain before his eyes, was reminded that "the wages of sin is *death*." The victim was then burned to ashes, thus showing both the instrument and the completeness of the sinner's destruction; and so the penitent was taught in a manner that he could not misunderstand nor forget, "the wicked shall perish, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs; they shall consume; into smoke shall they consume away." *SITI January 1, 1885, page 9.2*

Now no one can deny that these sacrifices typified Christ's sacrifice, nor that Christ himself did really die for sinners, unless he denies the truth of the Bible. Then the conclusion is unavoidable that if Christ had not died all men must have died, for all men are sinners; and further, since "he was manifested to take away our sin," thus saving us from death because he saves us from sin, it is just as evident that those who do not wash their robes of character and make them white in the blood of the Lamb, will in the end perish. Their fate will be the same as though no sacrifice had been made.

This is what David learned when he went into the sanctuary of the Lord, and this made him content with his hard lot.*SITI January 1, 1885, page 9.3*

One text more must suffice for the direct testimony concerning the destruction of the wicked. We give it because the contrast between the righteous and the wicked is so marked. It is *Psalm 37:37, 37*: “Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright; for the end of that man is peace. But the *transgressors shall be destroyed* together; the end of the wicked shall be cut off.” Note the contrast: The end of the upright is peace, but the end of the wicked shall be cut off. Dr. Barnes says that the word rendered “end” means properly “the last or extreme part; then, the end or issue of any thing, that which comes *after* it; then, the after time, the future, the hereafter. *Isaiah 2:2; Micah 4:1; Genesis 49:1. Daniel 10:14*. It may, therefore, refer to *anything* future; and would be well expressed by the word *hereafter*.” The Septuagint has *engkatateimma*, the meaning of which is, according to Liddell and Scott, “a reminder.” Substituting this meaning in the place of the word as translated, we get the full force of the text. Thus: “Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright; for the *remainder* of that man is peace. But the transgressors shall be destroyed together; the *remainder* of the wicked shall be cut off.” And this agrees with what the psalmist says in the earlier part of this, and in the seventy-third psalm. The righteous, although they may be plagued and afflicted in this earth, will, in the new earth, “delight themselves in the abundance of peace” all the remainder of their lives, which will last to all eternity. But the remainder of the wicked, who now have all that they desire, shall be cut off. Nothing could more clearly express their other extinction. “The end [remainder or hereafter] of the wicked shall be cut off,” *i.e.*, there shall be no remainder to their lives. E. J. W.*SITI January 1, 1885, page 9.4*

“The Lord’s Supper and the Laying On of Hands” The Signs of the Times, 11, 1.

E. J. Waggoner

The following earnest letter of inquiry to the editor was recently received from a reader of the SIGNS, in Iowa:*SITI January 1,*

1885, page 9.5

“To-night I have finished the second reading of your work, ‘Thoughts on Baptism,’ particularly that part relating to trine immersion. I bitterly opposed the Adventists here in Iowa, for nearly two years, but now I inquire of them. Baptism has been the hardest point to yield, so far. (I was a trine immersionist.) I have been looking up your references as far as I am able, and so far I have found them correct. I have compared yours and J. H. Moore’s tract, and as the light comes in, I believe more and more in single immersion. I believe your tract [pamphlet] will settle the difficulty with me. But there are other things that I do not yet understand.*SITI January 1, 1885, page 9.6*

“Why do not the Adventists observe the Lord’s Supper? as it is evident the Lord with his apostles partook of a full meal. *John 13:4*. And in *1 Corinthians 11:20*, Paul speaks of the Lord’s Supper, and if a hint that it, as Paul gives, shows that such a thing did exist, why are not the Dunkards right; partaking of a full meal? They (the Dunkards) also lay hands on the baptized, that they may receive the Holy Ghost. *Acts 8:17*. Why do not the Adventist do so?*SITI January 1, 1885, page 9.7*

“I write this verily for information and explanations of the Scriptures referred to. Please don’t delay. I desire to be in harmony with Christ and his people before probation closes. Yours fraternally, in hope. J. J. E.”*SITI January 1, 1885, page 9.8*

THE LORD’S SUPPER

Our brother is mistaken in supposing that Adventists do not celebrate the Lord’s Supper. We judge, however, that he does not regard the ceremony which will serve as being really the Lord’s Supper, because it is not an ordinary, regular meal. That the Lord’s Supper as celebrated by Adventists, and Christian churches generally, is identical in the form with that instituted by our Lord, and that to making it an ordinary meal is a perversion of the ordinances, can be easily demonstrated by the Bible, to the satisfaction, we think, of our inquiring brother.*SITI January 1, 1885, page 9.9*

1. It is true that Paul, in his letter to the Corinthians, does speak of a full meal in connection with the Lord's Supper, but only to condemn the practice. In this first epistle the apostle corrects many errors of the Corinthian church. After rebuking certain other unseemly practices, he takes up their manner of celebrating the Lord's Supper, and says (*1 Corinthians 11:20, 21*): "When ye come together therefore into one place, this is not to eat the Lord's Supper. For in eating everyone taketh the before other his own supper; and one is hungry and another is drunken." That is to say, "Although you profess to celebrate the Lord's Supper, you do not take it in fact, because you eat and drink to satisfy the demands of appetite." No stronger evidence than these two verses is needed to show that those who partake of a full meal under the impression that they are celebrating the Lord's Supper, are grievously mistaken. In astonishment at their obtuseness, the apostle continues: "What? have ye not houses to eat and to drink in? Or despise ye the house of God, and shame them that have not? What shall I say to you? shall I praise you in this? I praise you not." *SITI January 1, 1885, page 9.10*

2. Although the ordinance of the Lord's Supper was instituted on the night of the last Passover, it was entirely distinct from that meal. This is apparent from an examination of the records of the evangelist. Matthews says: "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; *this* is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for *this* is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." *Chap. 26:26-28*. Mark's words are almost the same. Luke says (*chap. 22:19, 20*): "And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body which is given for you; *this do* in remembrance of me. Likewise also the cup *after supper*, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you." *SITI January 1, 1885, page 9.11*

From these texts we learn (1) That it is only the bread and the wine that commemorate our Lord's death; and (2) That these emblems were partaken of "after supper," *i. e.*, after the Passover meal. Both these points are very clearly made by Paul and *1 Corinthians 11:23-26*, after he had shown the Corinthians what the Lord's Supper is

not. We quote: "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: *this do in remembrance of me*. After the same manner also he took the cup, when *he had supped* ["after the eating of the evening meal"], saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood; *this do ye*, as oft as ye drink it, *in remembrance of me*. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." *SITI January 1, 1885, page 9.12*

This is too plain to be misunderstood. Paul did not depend upon hearsay for his evidence, but received it directly from the Lord himself. All that they were to do in remembrance of Christ, as showing forth his death till he should come, was to break and eat bread, and drink of the cup; and this memorial was instituted after the supper was over, and was entirely distinct from it. The Lord's Supper consists simply in partaking of the bread and wine, emblems of the broken body and spilled blood of Christ; whatever more is added is a perversion of the ordinance. Since the institution of the memorial was entirely distinct from the Passover Supper, and had no reference to it, there is no more reason for having the celebration of the Lord's Supper preceded by a full, ordinary meal, than there would be for introducing it by the performance of some other act of Christ on that day. *SITI January 1, 1885, page 9.13*

More proof might be given on this subject, but it would seem that these Bible statements of what the Lord's Supper is, and the declaration by Paul that the eating of a meal is not the Lord's Supper, should be sufficient to settle the matter. *SITI January 1, 1885, page 9.14*

LAYING ON OF HANDS

To the question why the Adventists do not lay hands on baptized persons, that they may receive the Holy Ghost, it would be sufficient reply to say that no such act is commanded. The gospel commission (*Matthew 28:19, 20*) says nothing of the laying on of hands, in addition to baptism; consequently we have no authority for such a custom. *SITI January 1, 1885, page 9.15*

More than this, we find that the Holy Ghost was not given in a fixed, arbitrary manner, even in the apostles' time. In the case cited, and in *Acts 19:6*, we learn that the apostles laid hands on baptized persons, who then received the Holy Ghost; but in *Acts 10:44, 45* we have an instance where the Holy Ghost fell on a room full of people who had not been baptized, and without the imposition of a human hand; and in the case of the conversion and baptism of the eunuch (*Acts 8:26-40*), which is related with great minuteness, we have no intimation concerning any act of laying on of hands. When the apostles laid hands on those whom they baptized, it seems to have been in view of an especial work which they were to perform. *SITI January 1, 1885, page 9.16*

With these facts before us, and others that might be cited, we think that might be cited, we think that Adventists would be acting in a very presumptuous and unwarranted manner, if, in partial imitation of the apostles, they should lay hands on people in order that they might receive the Holy Ghost. E. J. W. *SITI January 1, 1885, page 10.1*

January 8, 1885

“The Sabbath-School” *The Signs of the Times*, 11, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—JAN. 24

1. When will all the nations of earth be gathered before the Lord? *SITI January 8, 1885, page 22.1*

2. How many classes of people will there be? *SITI January 8, 1885, page 22.2*

3. Name and describe them? *SITI January 8, 1885, page 22.3*

4. What will be said to those on the right hand—the righteous? *Matthew 25:34. SITI January 8, 1885, page 22.4*

5. What will the Lord say to those on the left? *Verse 41. SITI January 8, 1885, page 22.5*

6. Have any people ever yet been punished with everlasting or eternal fire? *Jude 7. SITI January 8, 1885, page 22.6*

7. Describe the fate of Sodom and Gomorrha. *Genesis 19:24, 25. SITI January 8, 1885, page 22.7*

8. How long a time, in comparison with eternity, did it take to accomplish this overthrow? *Lamentations 4:6. SITI January 8, 1885, page 22.8*

9. As the result of being overthrown by “everlasting fire,” what did those cities become? *2 Peter 2:6. SITI January 8, 1885, page 22.9*

10. After the cities became ashes what must have become of the fire? *SITI January 8, 1885, page 22.10*

11. Then does “everlasting fire” necessarily burn to all eternity? *SITI January 8, 1885, page 22.11*

12. What did the prophet Malachi say of the fierceness of the fires of the last day? *Malachi 4:1.SITI January 8, 1885, page 22.12*

13. As the result of this fire, what will the wicked be? *Verse 3.SITI January 8, 1885, page 22.13*

14. When this takes place, what will have become of the fire which devoured them?*SITI January 8, 1885, page 22.14*

15. What wonderful promise was made concerning Jerusalem, on condition that the people should obey the Lord? *Jeremiah 17:24, 25.SITI January 8, 1885, page 22.15*

16. What did the Lord say that he would do if they did not obey him? *Verse 27.SITI January 8, 1885, page 22.16*

17. What did he say that this fire should do? *Ib.SITI January 8, 1885, page 22.17*

18. What did he say should not be done to the fire? *Ib.SITI January 8, 1885, page 22.18*

19. What is the meaning of the word “devour”?*SITI January 8, 1885, page 22.19*

20. If the fire, when kindled, had been quenched, would the gates and palaces have been devoured?*SITI January 8, 1885, page 22.20*

21. When that upon which the flames were feeding was “devoured,” what must have become of the fire?*SITI January 8, 1885, page 22.21*

22. What did Christ say of the fire into which the wicked are to be cast? *Mark 9:45.SITI January 8, 1885, page 22.22*

23. Since the fire is not to be quenched, what will it do? *Revelation 20:9.SITI January 8, 1885, page 22.23*

24. Then how much of the wicked will there be left? *Malachi 4:1.SITI January 8, 1885, page 22.24*

It has been said that the Bible is like a fiddle, because it will play any tune that is desired. To this it has justly been replied that you can get only one tune from a fiddle if you keep your fingers off from the strings. So the Bible of itself does not teach many and contradictory doctrines, but only one, harmonious in all its parts. In no case is this better illustrated than in the doctrine of the punishment of the wicked, which we are now considering. If we only let the Bible explain itself, nothing more harmonious was ever seen. Our lesson covers one or two texts which suffer much from being tampered with by human hands; let us see how they appear when the Bible is used as a commentary. *SITI January 8, 1885, page 22.25*

“Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.” The “angels that kept not their first estate” sinned against such great light that there was for them no forgiveness. If man had not yielded to temptation, they would alone have suffered the torments of the everlasting fire; but now they are to be accompanied by wicked men who will not be forgiven. “And this torment is never to end,” says one, and then, of perchance, he asks, “Is it just for God to cause a man to suffer the eternal torment for the sins committed in one short life?” We answer, It must be, if that is what he has threatened to do. We are not to decide by our ideas of justice what God ought to or will do, but must derive our ideas of justice from what God says he will do; for he is the embodiment of justice, as well as of every other desirable thing. Perhaps if we study carefully, we shall find that God has not threatened anybody with eternal torment. Eternal *punishment*, as we learned last week, is threatened; but we must remember that this punishment is *death*, and that no one has received his punishment until death takes place, and then *torment* must necessarily cease. *SITI January 8, 1885, page 22.26*

As we read along the New Testament, with this text in mind, our attention is caught by a similar expression in Jude, the seventh verse: “Even as Sodom and Gomorrha, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.” Everybody is familiar with the story of the destruction

of Sodom. It is found in *Genesis 19*. There we learn (*verses 24, 25*) that God rained upon Sodom and Gomorrha fire and brimstone, and *overthrew* them and all their inhabitants. Peter tells us how complete was this overthrow: "And turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrha *into ashes* condemned them with an overthrow, making them an ensample unto those that after should live ungodly." 2 *Peter 2:6*. When a thing is reduced to ashes, we know that every particle of it that is combustible has been burned, and that fire can no longer be kept burning upon it. In fact, there is no surer way of putting out a fire than of covering it with ashes, for they are incombustible. So then the cities of Sodom and Gomorrha having been long since turned to ashes, must have, for an equally long time, ceased to burn; nobody will question this, for all believe that a portion of the Dead Sea covers a place where they once stood. *SITI January 8, 1885, page 22.27*

And still those cities suffered the vengeance of "eternal fire." This being true, we reasonably conclude that although the wicked are to go into everlasting or eternal fire, they need not necessarily continue to burn to all eternity. At least *Matthew 25:41* does not teach that they will. Now if we carry our investigation a little further, we shall see that, as in the case of the cities of the plain when they were turned to ashes, the fire which prey upon the wicked must cease to burn. "For, behold, the day cometh, that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble: and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch." *Malachi 4:1*. Stubble cannot long withstand the action of fire, and we are not surprised to learn that if the wicked are stubble nothing will be left of them when once they are subjected to the flames. But read *verse 3*: "And ye shall tread down the wicked; for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet in the day that I shall do this, saith the Lord of hosts." That settles the matter beyond controversy. We know not how long a time it may take to reduce the wicked to ashes; to our comprehension it will doubtless be a very long time; but we are certain that they eventually will be ashes, and are just as certain that when that time comes, the "everlasting fire" which consumed them will have ceased to burn. *SITI January 8, 1885, page 22.28*

The learned commentator, Dr. Barnes, although he believed in the

eternal torment of the wicked, has given the following just criticism on Jude seven:-*SITI January 8, 1885, page 22.29*

“The phrase ‘eternal fire’ is one that is often used to denote future punishment-as expressing the severity and intensity of suffering. See Notes on *Matthew 25:41*. As here used, it cannot mean that the fires which consumed Sodom and Gomorrha were literally eternal, or were kept always burning, for that was not true. The expression seems to denote, in this connection, two things: (1) that the destruction of the cities of the plain, with their inhabitants, was as entire and perpetual *as if* the fires had been always burning-the consumption was absolute and enduring-the sinners were wholly cut off, and the cities forever rendered desolate; and (2) that in its nature and duration this was a striking emblem of the destruction which will come upon the ungodly.”*SITI January 8, 1885, page 22.30*

Mark 9:45 is another text that is sadly misunderstood. People think, or, rather, conclude without thinking, that “fire that never shall be quenched” must of course always continue to burn. But what is the natural consequence to perishable substances when the fire into which they are cast is not quenched? Why, they are burned up, of course. They are speedily reduced to ashes, and then the fire, which was not quenched, dies a natural death. Throw stubble into the fire; if you speedily quench the flame, the stubble may be saved; but if the fire is unquenchable, nothing can keep the stubble from becoming utterly consumed. So of the wicked; if the Bible said that the fire shall be quenched, we should know that they would escape punishment; but no human power can quench the fire of the last day, and God said that he will not. So we must conclude, even if the Bible did not tell us, that the wicked are to be *devoured*, not preserve alive. When the fire has done its work, they will be left “neither root to nor branch.” E. J. W.*SITI January 8, 1885, page 22.31*

“False Witness” The Signs of the Times, 11, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

Some time ago we received a circular from a crank who pretended

to know exactly when the Lord would come. We say “a crank,” because his professed “calculations” showed that in his mental make-up he was decidedly crooked. He represented nobody, and made no pretensions to, and we thought we treated his guess-work with great respect when we promptly granted it a place in the waste basket. The time that he had set was Jan. 5, 1885, and as this date is in the past, he is doubtless now at work on a new and improved computation.*SITI January 8, 1885, page 25.1*

But news was scarce after election, and the most of the papers to which this circular was sent, gave it a prominent place in their columns. More than this, both secular and religious papers have given the gratuitous information that “the Adventists have fixed it that the end of the world is to be January 5, 1885.” When this statement was first noticed, a denial of it, and a true statement of the case was sent to the San Francisco *Bulletin*, which showed its fairness by giving it as prominent a place as it did the other. But not one of the papers that copied the original charge have copied the refutation. After that refutation appeared in the *Bulletin*, a religious journal in San Francisco repeated the statement that the Adventists have fixed the time for the end of the world. We can only conclude that, not having been able to make any headway against the doctrines of the seventh day at best, it is willing, in order to create prejudice against them, to place itself among those who love and make a lie.*SITI January 8, 1885, page 25.2*

Wherever Seventh-day Adventists are known, it is well understood that they set no time for the Lord to come, and have no sympathy with those who do so. It is true that some who profess to be Adventists do presume to fix the time when the Lord will come; but the unwarranted act of a few irresponsible persons should not be set down against an entire denomination, which repudiates both the persons and their methods.*SITI January 8, 1885, page 25.3*

The Lord himself, speaking of his coming, said, “But of that day and hour knoweth no man.” This is in the same chapter in which he says that after certain signs have taken place, we must “*know* that he is near, even at the doors.” The same word that obliges us to be Adventists, also obliges us to confess our ignorance as to the day, or month, or year when the Master will return.*SITI January 8, 1885,*

page 25.4

We have no expectation of causing false reports to cease. We do not suppose that, because of our protests, people will cease to show their contempt for the Bible doctrine of the coming of the Lord, by maligning and ridiculing those who profess it. On the contrary, we expect that such things will increase. Personally they did not trouble us, and our only object in noticing them is to disabuse the minds of some who have innocently believed these false reports, and who, but for them, would look with favor on the doctrines which we are sure are of vital importance. E. J. W. *SITI January 8, 1885,*
page 25.5

January 15, 1885

“Punishment of the Wicked-Continued” *The Signs of the Times*, 11, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—JAN. 31

1. With what does Paul say that the wicked shall be punished? 2 *Thessalonians 1:7-9*. *SITI January 15, 1885, page 38.1*
2. When will this punishment take place? *SITI January 15, 1885, page 38.2*
3. From whom does this destruction come? *SITI January 15, 1885, page 38.3*
4. What does the prophet Joel say of the day of the Lord? *Joel 1:15*. *SITI January 15, 1885, page 38.4*
5. What is the agent of this destruction that comes from the Lord? 2 *Thessalonians 2:8; Revelation 20:9*. *SITI January 15, 1885, page 38.5*
6. What does the inspired writer say of the suffering of those who are thus *devoured*? *Revelation 20:10*. *SITI January 15, 1885, page 38.6*
7. Repeat another testimony on this point. *Revelation 14:9-11*. *SITI January 15, 1885, page 38.7*
8. What, in ancient times, was the law concerning Hebrew servants? *Exodus 21:2*. *SITI January 15, 1885, page 38.8*
9. If in the seventh year the servant refused to leave his master, what was done? *Verses 5, 6*. *SITI January 15, 1885, page 38.9*
10. After the ceremony of boring the servant's ear had been performed, how long was he to serve his master? *Ib.* *SITI January*

15, 1885, page 38.10

11. Can this by any possibility mean that in such a case the servant was never to die? *SITI January 15, 1885, page 38.11*

12. What must we understand by the expression, “he shall serve him forever”? (See note.) *SITI January 15, 1885, page 38.12*

13. Then what may we understand by similar expressions concerning the torment of the wicked? *SITI January 15, 1885, page 38.13*

14. What positive proof can you give that those sufferings will eventually be terminated by cessation of existence? *Malachi 4:1, 3. SITI January 15, 1885, page 38.14*

15. How many other texts do you remember that prove the same thing? *SITI January 15, 1885, page 38.15*

“Seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you; and to you who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power.” *2 Thessalonians 1:6-9*. The time when this vengeance will be taken on the disobedient is stated in *verses 7 and 10*. It is when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, and when he shall be glorified in his saints. Compare *Matthew 25:31-36*. *SITI January 15, 1885, page 38.16*

There is a quite general misunderstanding of this text in Thessalonians. We frequently hear it quoted as though it read that the wicked shall be banished from the presence of the Lord. But the text says no such thing. Further, to be banished from the presence of the Lord is an impossibility, for God is omnipresent; he fills the universe; and still further, if such a thing were possible, it would be no punishment for the wicked, but would be what they would desire. No position could be more unsatisfactory to a wicked man than to be continually in the presence of God. What the text does say of the

wicked is that they “shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power.” The destruction comes from the Lord. So we read in *Joel 1:15* that the day of the Lord comes “as a destruction from the Almighty.” And Paul in another place says that the wicked shall be consumed by the spirit of his mouth, and destroyed by the brightness of his coming, thus showing how they are destroyed from, or by, the glory of his power. *SITI January 15, 1885, page 38.17*

From *Revelation 21:9*, as well as elsewhere, we learn that fire is to be the agent in the destruction of the wicked. As they compass the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city, fire comes down from God out of heaven, and *devours* them. This indicates complete extermination. Then what are we to understand when, in the next verse, we read that they “shall be tormented day and night forever and ever”? Some may answer that this applies only to the devil, who deceived them. This will not meet the difficulty, since the Scriptures do not teach that Satan is to be punished differently from the wicked, except in degree; and in *Revelation 14:11* we have a statement concerning the wicked, that is similar to that in *Revelation 22:10*. Now since John, looking at things that are to be, as though they had been, saw that the fire *devoured* the wicked, and Paul says that they shall be punished with everlasting *destruction*, we must conclude that “forever and ever” must be limited in duration. For if the wicked are always to exist in torment, then it would necessarily follow that they will never be destroyed nor devoured. *SITI January 15, 1885, page 38.18*

The Bible must be its own interpreter, and we will let this text, which seems obscure, be explained by another one, which has no obscurity. Turn to *Exodus 21*, and read *verses 2-6*: “If thou buy an Hebrew servant, six years he shall serve: and in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing. If he came in by himself, he shall go out by himself; if he were married, then his wife shall go out with him. If his master have given him a wife, and she have born him sons or daughters; the wife and her children shall be her master’s, and he shall go out by himself. And if the servant shall plainly say, I love my master, my wife, and my children; I will not go out free; then his master shall bring him unto the judges; he shall also bring him to the door, or unto the door post; and his master shall bore his ear

through with an awl; and he shall serve him for ever.” We say that there is no obscurity in this passage. The different parts of the transaction are clearly indicated, and the result is plainly stated: after having his ear bored through which an awl, the servant was to continue a bondman forever. And no one would mistake the statement, and suppose that the servant was to endure the rigors of servitude throughout the ceaseless ages of eternity. Certainly not. All would agree that this means simply that the servant could, under those circumstances, derive no benefit from the Sabbatic year, but that he must serve without intermission just as long as his life should last. This is all there is to it. *SITI January 15, 1885, page 38.19*

“But why,” says one, “do you introduce such an instance as that?” In order to show that the term “forever” does not necessarily indicate that the thing to which it is applied has no end. It may be applied to an object that is in its nature perishable, as in the case of the servant. In general this rule may be laid down: Whenever there is anything in the nature of the object spoken of that forbids the idea of its eternal existence, the term “forever” merely implies continuity of existence. God’s word forbids us to imagine that the wicked shall exist throughout eternity; so when we read that they shall be “tormented day and night forever and ever,” we are to understand that their torments will be long, and will be unintermitting until they are utterly consumed. That such a time will come is taught by the word of the Lord: “For, behold, the day cometh, that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and *all that do wickedly*, shall be stubble: and the day that cometh *shall burn them up*, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall *leave them neither root nor branch.*” *Malachi 4:1*. “And ye shall tread down the wicked; for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet in the day that I shall do this, saith the Lord of hosts.” *Verse 3; Matthew 3:11, 12; 2 Thessalonians 1:7-9; 2:8; Revelation 22:9; Romans 6:23 John 3:16, 36; and many other texts may be cited to prove the same thing, namely, that the wicked will eventually be utterly exterminated.* E. J. W. *SITI January 15, 1885, page 38.20*

“A Puzzled Correspondent” The Signs of the Times, 11, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

From a gentlemen in Medina, Ohio, who has read a few copies of the SIGNS, we have received a letter which contains objections that are common to so many, and which seems to indicate a spirit of kindness and candor on the part of the writer, so that we are constrained to print it entire. It reads as follows:-*SITI January 15, 1885, page 40.1*

“DEAR BRETHREN: I have just received a copy of the SIGNS, an have read it with great pleasure and profit, though the journal is not new to me. Your views of the second advent, immortality through Christ, etc., all meet my views exactly. I do not understand the Sunday question, however, as you do. You seem to imply that if we begin on Sabbath, Dec. 5, 1884, and go back by sevens, we should arrive at the Sabbath which God gave to Moses; but as no sane man pretends to tell the year the law was given, of course we cannot tell where to stop, and hence all is guess-work. I am just as sure that to-day [Dec. 7] is the truth Sabbath, as you can be that Dec. 5 was.*SITI January 15, 1885, page 40.2*

“But even if we did know this, what then? I profess to be a Christian, and hence I care no more for what Moses commanded, than I do for what Mohammed commanded. Christ is the *end* of the law to everyone that believeth. He who follows Christ does more honor to Moses and the law than he does who worships law only. Christ elaborated every one of the commandments in the decalogue except regarding Sunday, or the ‘Sabbath,’ and of that he speaks as though it were more for us than we for that.*SITI January 15, 1885, page 40.3*

“If infidels cared nothing for Sunday, how can you make them respect Saturday? Why not change their hearts instead of their calendar?*SITI January 15, 1885, page 40.4*

“Yours in Christ, W. P. R.”*SITI January 15, 1885, page 40.5*

Our brother has got things sorely confused in his mind, but we will endeavor to set him straight in regard to them. In the first place, we shall inform him that since December 5 fell on Friday, we do not count that day either backward or forward, to find the Sabbath. We are Christians, not Mohammedans. He says, “I am just as sure that today [Dec. 7, the date of the letter] is the true Sabbath, as you can

be that Dec. 5 was.” Granted; but unless his confidence exceeds that, he will not be likely to do much homage to the Sunday. We can say ourselves that we also are “just as sure” that Sunday, December 7, was the Sabbath as we are that Friday, December 5, was, and not one particle more so. There is just the same Bible authority for keeping Sunday that there is for keeping Friday, and that is—just none at all. *SITI January 15, 1885, page 40.6*

Of one thing we are just as certain as it is possible to be of any thing, and that is that if, beginning with any Sabbath (Saturday), we should count back by sevens, we should find that we have the same seventh-day Sabbath which God commanded the Jews to keep, and upon which he rested in the beginning. It is not at all necessary that we should know the exact age of the world, nor the exact year in which the law was given. The following points establish the matter beyond all controversy: 1. The Sabbath of the fourth commandment is the one upon which God rested at creation. See *Exodus 20:8-11*; *Genesis 2:2, 3*. 2. It was the same day that was kept in the time of Christ, and of which he declared himself Lord (*Mark 2:28*), for the women who followed Jesus to the sepulcher returned and rested the Sabbath day “according to the commandment.” *Luke 23:56*. 3. It is not possible that the reckoning of days since that time could have been lost, for the Jews, who as a nation have kept the Sabbath quite strictly ever since the Babylonian captivity, were dispersed to every nation under the heavens, and there is not the slightest disagreement among them as to which day is the true Sabbath, no matter how widely separated they may be. Moreover, within a comparatively short time after the days of Christ, his professed followers adopted the day of the heathen festival of the sun,—the first day of the week,—professing to do it in honor of Christ’s resurrection on the first day of the week; not in whatever part of the world you go, you invariably find that the so-called “Christian Sabbath” is the day following the Sabbath which to Jews observe. Thus we know that the day of the Sabbath has never been lost since the creation. On this point, Bishop E. O. Haven, of the M. E. Church, said: *SITI January 15, 1885, page 40.7*

“There is no good reason for denying that the Jewish Sabbath is the true seventh day, reckoning from the creation of man, and that the Christian Sunday is the first day of the Hebrew week, or of the

genuine week.”-*Pillars of Truth*, p.89.*SITI January 15, 1885, page 41.1*

And now that we *know* that we have the original seventh-day Sabbath, “what then?” Says our brother: “I profess to be a Christian, and hence I care no more for what Moses commanded than I do for what Mohammed commanded.” Well, we profess to be Christians too, yet we care, far more for Moses than we do for Mohammed, because “we know that God spake unto Moses” (see *Numbers 12:6-8; Deuteronomy 34:10*), and there is no evidence that God ever manifested himself in any way to Mohammed. Christ was the prophet the Lord was to raise up, like unto Moses (*Deuteronomy 18:18, 19; Acts 3:22-26*); and he reproved the Jews because they did not really believe the words of Moses. Indeed Christ plainly says that they could not believe on him unless they first believed the words of Moses (*John 5:46, 47*); and therefore if our brother really cares no more for Moses than he does for Mohammed, he has the word of Christ before for it that his profession of Christianity amounts to nothing; that without believing Moses he cannot be a Christian. We do not believe that he carefully considered what he was writing.*SITI January 15, 1885, page 41.2*

But the Sabbath commandment does not rest on the authority of Moses. “And God spake all these words, saying, ... Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work,” etc. *Exodus 20:1-11*. “These words *the Lord spake* unto all your assembly in the mount out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with a great voice: and he added no more. And he wrote them in two tables of stone, and delivered them unto me.” *Deuteronomy 5:22*. Certainly our brother cares something for what the Lord commanded, even if he has no regard for Moses.*SITI January 15, 1885, page 41.3*

“Christ is the *end* of the law to everyone that believeth.” True; but must we therefore conclude that with every believer in Christ there must be an end of keeping the law? Let us try a case, and see if our brother will agree with us. I believe in Christ, therefore I will curse and swear, because Christ is the end of the law which says, “Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.” Again,

because I believe in Christ, who is the end of the law, I will shoot the next man I meet, and take his watch and purse. “No, no,” our friend will surely say, “that would not do; if you believe in Christ you must forsake sin.” Exactly; so say the Scriptures: “He that saith he abideth in him [Christ] ought himself also so to walk, even as he walked.” *1 John 2:6*. And he “did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth.” *1 Peter 2:22*. Sin is the transgression of the law (*1 John 3:4*); so then if we profess to abide in Christ we must cease transgressing the law, or, in other words, we must keep the law. Now by what rule does our brother decide that, because Christ is the end of law, we are at liberty to violate the fourth commandment, and are not at liberty to violate the third, sixth, or eighth? “Are not your ways unequal?” *SITI January 15, 1885, page 41.4*

Is the follower of Christ at liberty to break the law in any particular? Listen to the words of Jesus himself: “Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.” *Matthew 5:17-19*. “Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.” *Matthew 7:21*. *SITI January 15, 1885, page 41.5*

The follower of Christ it is not free to break the law, although Christ is the end of the law. Then in what sense is he the end of the it? In this sense that in the present state of the world Christ is the object of the law; *i.e.*, the law, having no power of itself to make sinful man perfect, drives them to Christ, in whom they may attain all the perfection which the law requires. Paul clearly expresses the case in a few words: “For what the law could not do, in that it was weak *through the flesh*, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.” *Romans 8:3, 4*. *SITI January 15, 1885, page 41.6*

“He who follows Christ does more honor to Moses and the law than he does who worships the law only.” Very true; for if any one “worships the law only,” he will make a miserable failure; “without me,” says Christ, “ye can do nothing.” Christ’s office is to enable us to do, as well as to cleanse us from past transgressions. One cannot be a follower of Christ without keeping the law.*SITI January 15, 1885, page 41.7*

“Christ elaborated every one of the commandments of the decalogue, except regarding Sunday.” Very much mixed. Christ said nothing about the second commandment, and did not elaborate the eighth, ninth, nor tenth; yet we do not feel of liberty to slight them on that account. And he certainly did not elaborate the commandment regarding Sunday, because no such commandment was in existence until the rise of the “man of sin,” many years after the time of Christ’s earthly ministry.*SITI January 15, 1885, page 41.8*

“The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath.” *Mark 2:27*. These are the expressed, not implied, words of Christ. It was made for man’s use. Now if our brother wishes to know just how God designs that man shall use the Sabbath, let him read the fourth commandment, and he will find out. God made the Sabbath for man to keep holy. Will our brother keep it so, and thus use the Sabbath as God intended it should be used?*SITI January 15, 1885, page 41.9*

The paragraph concerning infidels and the Sabbath will be noticed in another article. E. J. W.*SITI January 15, 1885, page 41.10*

“Easy Conversion” The Signs of the Times, 11, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

Much ado has been made over the announcement that Mr. M. K. Schermerhorn, one of the most prominent of Unitarian preachers, has been admitted into the Episcopal Church, and this taken orders therein, and “the church” has been congratulated upon so valuable and accession. According to Mr. Schemerhorn’s own statement, however, his “conversion” does not seem to have been prompted

wholly by unselfish motives. He says:-*SITI January 15, 1885, page 41.11*

“As to Unitarianism, I will say that it has been a constant disappointment to me, though I always tried to make the best of it. I have seen the Unitarian cause steadily declining. Out of fifteen societies in the New York and Hudson River Conferences, for instance, six have died outright during the past twelve years. No new ones have been started, and those remaining are, with three or four exceptions, just alive, and that is all. This same is more or less true all over America and England, too. In short, I lost all hope for any permanent growth of Unitarianism long before I left Newport, and this, in part, was what (providentially, as I now feel) caused me to turn my studies and thought in the direction of the older churches and faith.”*SITI January 15, 1885, page 41.12*

Even in politics such an avowal as that would not be considered a credit to any man. Much has been said, especially during the last campaign, about standing up for a principle, even though the party be in the minority; but here we find a clergyman openly announcing that he has left the church of which he was long champion, solely because he had no hope that it would ever rival other denominations, and people do not think that there is anything out of the way in his course. Well, why should they? Isn't popularity getting to be the standard of orthodoxy? Of late the discussion between Catholics and Protestants has waxed hot, as to whether Catholicism has really made the progress that is claimed for it, as though its character were to be judged by its ability to gain converts. One of the most common objections as we hear against the Sabbath of the Lord is, “Oh, there is only a mere handful of people that keep it, anyway.” And the argument upon which Sunday advocates are willing to rest their cause is that “everybody keeps Sunday.”*SITI January 15, 1885, page 41.13*

When people can pass from one church to another, or from the world to the church, so easily, what is to hinder the whole world from being “converted”? and then the millennium will be ushered in. It is natural for man to love to be on the winning side; and as soon as the church can demonstrate that she is the strongest power in the world, people without number will feel “providentially” directed to

join her communion. E. J. W. *SITI January 15, 1885, page 41.14*

“‘Christian Consciousness’ vs. the Bible” *The Signs of the Times*, 11, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

In a recent number of the *Independent*, Prof. Francis L. Patton sharply criticizes a statement by Dr. Harris, in the *Andover Review*, that “Christian consciousness” must be recognized as the final authority in matters of faith and practice. In the course of his article he says:-*SITI January 15, 1885, page 41.15*

“Common consciousness cannot be appealed to as the criterion of religious progress without danger of jeopardizing the Protestant principle that the Bible is the rule of faith. Dr. Harris admits that what he calls the ‘obsolescent theology’ agrees as well with a word of God as it ever did, but affirms that it does not agree with the Christian consciousness. Suppose, however, that the Bible should say one thing, and Christian consciousness should say something else; or suppose that Christian consciousness should undertake to supplement the Bible. What then? It is an old charge against those who have had an objective rule of faith, that they made the word of God of none effect through their traditions, and that they taught for doctrines the commandments of men. We know how the Roman Catholic churches followed the example of the scribes and Pharisees in this respect. Is there no danger that a party will rise in the Protestant churches, committing the same error? We think that there is great danger. And when, under the influence of a zeal that lacks both knowledge and discretion, the attempt is made to force upon the conscience of men the yoke of party fanaticism and popular clamor, there is little doubt but that an earnest, but at the same time ignorant, quietism will find great use for the phrase that is under discussion, and as a *phrase*, catchword, appealing to the sympathies of the unthinking, that Christian consciousness may become the ‘organ’ of what some will call religious progress.” *SITI January 15, 1885, page 41.16*

There is as little doubt that the state of things outlined by the professor is imminent, as there is that “Christian consciousness” is superseding the Bible, as a test in matters of religion. We see this

“Christian consciousness” manifested in that form of worship which mistakes feeling for faith, whose adherents *know* that they are right, because their hearts tell them so!*SITI January 15, 1885, page 41.17*

And especially is it manifested in those who would be enforce the observance of the Sunday because a majority of Christians had declared, by precept and example, that Sunday is the Lord’s day. The plain language of the fourth commandment is ignored by the Protestants and Catholics alike, for the custom and sentiment of “the church.” E. J. W.*SITI January 15, 1885, page 41.18*

“The Work in Healdsburg” The Signs of the Times, 11, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

The winter term of the College opened on Monday, January 5, with 120 students in attendance. Of this number fifty-six are now enrolled in the special Bible course. Besides these, we know of several who expect to join us in a few days. All seem to be in earnest, and disposed to make the most of their present opportunities.*SITI January 15, 1885, page 48.1*

The family at the Students’ Home now numbers fifty-six. This number will soon be increased. The new students readily fall in with the ways of the place, and cheerfully perform their allotted tasks of labor and study. We are certain that the benefit derived from the discipline at the “Home” is fully equal to that gained at the college proper. No parent should think of sending his child to the Healdsburg College, and not have him live at the Students’ Home. We hope that God will bless the labors of this term, and make them fruitful for good in his cause.*SITI January 15, 1885, page 48.2*

E. J. W.
Healdsburg, January 8.

January 22, 1885

“Punishment of the Wicked-Continued” *The Signs of the Times*, 11, 4.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST.—FEB. 21

1. Give a scriptural explanation of *Revelation 14:9-11; 20:10*. *SITI January 22, 1885, page 54.1*
2. When the wicked have been simply *tormented* with fire and brimstone, have they received their reward? *Romans 6:23*. *SITI January 22, 1885, page 54.2*
3. Then what must that fire do in order that the wicked may receive their deserts? *Malachi 4:1*. *SITI January 22, 1885, page 54.3*
4. What is appointed unto all men? *Hebrews 9:27*. *SITI January 22, 1885, page 54.4*
5. Can this death, to which all men are appointed, be the death which is the wages of sin? *SITI January 22, 1885, page 54.5*
6. What is promised to all men, regardless of their character? *1 Corinthians 15:22; Acts 24:15*. *SITI January 22, 1885, page 54.6*
7. Are the wicked now suffering their punishment? *2 Peter 2:9*. *SITI January 22, 1885, page 54.7*
8. When will ever man be rewarded according to his works? *Matthew 2:9*. *SITI January 22, 1885, page 54.8*
9. Then for what purpose will they come forth from their graves? *Job 21:29, 30*. *SITI January 22, 1885, page 54.9*
10. Give further proof that the death which is common to all men is not the wages of sin. *Ezekiel 18:26*. *SITI January 22, 1885, page 54.10*

11. What is it that causes the death which is the wages of sin? *Revelation 20:9.SITI January 22, 1885, page 54.11*

12. What is this death by fire called? *Revelation 21:8.SITI January 22, 1885, page 54.12*

13. How long is it after the resurrection of the righteous before the wicked are “brought forth” to destruction? *Revelation 20:4, 5.SITI January 22, 1885, page 54.13*

14. Who will escape the second death? *Revelation 2:11; 20:6.SITI January 22, 1885, page 54.14*

“And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever: and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name.” *Revelation 14:9-11.SITI January 22, 1885, page 54.15*

It is not the province of this lesson to explain the meaning of the beast, his image, or his mark. It is sufficient to say that to worship the first two, or receive the last, must be the most heinous crime that man can commit, since it brings down upon the offender the unmingled wine of the wrath of God. The point to be explained is the expression, “and the smoke of their torment ascendeth but forever and ever.” As this has been explained in past lessons, a brief mention here will be sufficient. If the student will read *Exodus 21:2-6*, he will find that the term “forever” does not necessarily denote that the thing to which it is applied shall never cause to exist; for under certain conditions a servant was to serve his master *forever*, which could not possibly mean “without end.” Now if that term does not *necessarily* mean “without end,” *Revelation 14:9-11* affords no proof that the wicked will be tormented to all eternity. That doctrine, if true, must be approved by other texts. But we have already learned that the wicked are to be stubble in a fire that shall “burn them up,” and will leave them “neither root nor branch.” Then,

as in *Exodus 21:2-6* we understand that “forever” means as long as the servant might live, so we must understand that *Revelation 14:9-11* teaches that the smoke from the torment of the wicked will ascend without any cessation, until there are no wicked left in existence. *SITI January 22, 1885, page 54.16*

This explanation will also suffice for *Revelation 20:10*: “And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever.” The preceding verse shows that the fire has already “devoured” the wicked; this shows that the devil, the author of sin, survives to see the destruction of all his works. That he himself will, after a long torment, cease to exist, we are well assured, because Christ did not die in vain, and he died that he might “destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil.” *Hebrews 2:14*. Satan is the “root” from which all wickedness springs; the day that cometh shall leave neither root nor branch. *SITI January 22, 1885, page 54.17*

It is true that “indignation and wrath, tribulation, and the anguish” are threatened to “every soul of man that doeth evil” (*Romans 2:8, 9*), yet we are by no means to suppose that those things comprise the sum of the punishment which the wicked are to receive. “The wages of sin is death,” and then until death takes place, the sinners will not have received their punishment. They are to be “punished with everlasting destruction;” and this will not be until their torment has been ended by the eternal death. *SITI January 22, 1885, page 54.18*

Certainly no one can gather from the Scriptures that the death with which we are so familiar is the wages of sin. “It is appointed unto man wants to die;” all men, both good and bad, die because they have inherited a mortal nature, and not because they have sinned. To all men, whether good or bad, there is promised a resurrection (*Acts 24:15; 1 Corinthians 15:22*) from the death which they die as a consequence of being the descendants of mortal Adam; now if this death were the penalty for sin, then the resurrection would be the revoking of the penalty; but this can never be, because, when once inflicted, it is to be everlasting. That none of the wicked are now receiving the penalty for their sins is evident from *2 Peter 2:9*:

“The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished.” Those who are dead are preserved in their graves, from which, at the voice of Christ, they shall come forth. *John 5:28, 29*. Job also says that “the wicked is reserved to the day of destruction,” and that “they shall be brought forth to the day of wrath.” *Job 21:30*. *SITI January 22, 1885, page 54.19*

In *Ezekiel 18:26* we have most conclusive evidence that the death which Adam died, and which all his posterity have likewise suffered, was not as a penalty for sin. It reads thus: “When a righteous man turneth away from his righteousness, and *commiteth iniquity*, and *dieth in them*; for his iniquity that he hath done *shall he die*.” The prophet here mentions two deaths. If a man dies in his sins, *i.e.*, if he does not repent before death overtakes him, then he shall die. But if he is dead, how can he die? Evidently he must have a resurrection, and this, as we of seen, is promised to all men, irrespective of character. Those that have done evil come forth from their graves to the resurrection of damnation. *John 5:28, 29*. And in harmony with this idea are the words of *Revelation 21:8*: “But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: *which is the second death*.” *SITI January 22, 1885, page 54.20*

Revelation 20:6 shows when the wicked are “brought forth” to suffer the second death. The apostle in *verse 4* mentions the righteous who have been martyred, who, he says, lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. They had been dead, but now lived. This, he says, is the “first resurrection.” It is the first because “the rest of the dead lived not *again* until the thousand years were finished.” The word again implies another living, or a resurrection. So a thousand years intervene between the resurrection of the righteous and that of the wicked. “Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; upon such the second death hath no power.” This statement has no force unless those who do not have part in the first resurrection do suffer the second death. This is the death which is the wages of sin, and is brought about by fire. It is yet future, and will not take place until the harvest, -“the end of the world”-when the tares will be gathered out and bound in bundles to be burned.

Matthew 13:24-30, 36-43. E. J. W.SITI January 22, 1885, page 54.21

“Will Worship, and No Worship” The Signs of the Times, 11, 4.

E. J. Waggoner

The last paragraph of the letter upon which we commented last week reads as follows:-*SITI January 22, 1885, page 56.1*

“If infidels care nothing for Sunday, how can you make them respect Saturday? Why not change their hearts instead of their calendar?”*SITI January 22, 1885, page 56.2*

We will notice the last question first. That such a question could be asked, is evidence of the almost entire absence of *thought* concerning the subject of the Sabbath. How the questioner could have obtained the idea that anybody wants to change the calendar, is beyond all comprehension. It is certain that we do not desire any such thing. We are satisfied with the calendar that we have. With Bishop Haven, we believe that our week corresponds to the Hebrew week,-the genuine week,-and that “the Jewish Sabbath,” as he termed Saturday, is the true seventh day, the one which God blessed and sanctified. All the change we desire, is a change in men’s hearts, a change which will be indicated by their changed practices. Keeping the calendar that they have, we want them to rest upon the day which God appointed, instead of on one of which he spoke nothing; to obey the word of the Lord, instead of their own inclinations. If we were in the habit of going to San Francisco every Wednesday, and should change our custom and afterward go on Tuesday, would we thereby change the calendar, or the reckoning of days? Of course not. Why cannot people of reason as intelligently in regard to moral duties as they do concerning ordinary, temporal affairs?*SITI January 22, 1885, page 56.3*

The first question in the paragraph above quoted indicates another erroneous idea that has obtained considerable currency. It is imagined that if people lose their confidence in the Sunday institution they will pay no regard to any day; and from this point people jump to the conclusion that we do wrong in exposing the

fraud by which Sunday is made to appear to be the Sabbath. We shall see how much truth there is in these conclusions. *SITI January 22, 1885, page 56.4*

"If infidels care nothing for Sunday, how can you make them respect Saturday?" In turn, we would ask, If people *do not* lose their respect for Sunday as a sacred institution, how can they be made to respect the Sabbath of the Lord? Said the Saviour, "Ye cannot serve God and Mammon;" "no can serve two masters." So no man can regard the Sabbath as holy to the Lord, and at the same time give equal homage to Sunday. To answer more directly, we say that we would get them to respect the Sabbath, by inducing them to respect its Author. Let their hearts be changed, so that they will reverence God and his word, and the work is already done. If people really have reverence for God's word (not merely such portions as suit their fancy, but the whole of it), they will reverence the fourth commandment; and if they respect the fourth commandment, they must necessarily keep the seventh day,- Saturday,-as is therein enjoined. *SITI January 22, 1885, page 56.5*

As a matter of fact there are thousands who now respect God's holy Sabbath, who have not the slightest regard for Sunday; and the number of such persons is being increased every day. We readily grant that the great majority of people cannot be induced to respect the Sabbath; but shall we for this reason cease to work for those who will accept the truth? Because we cannot rescue *all* the inmates of a burning building, shall we make no effort to save any? *SITI January 22, 1885, page 56.6*

And now we would like to ask our friend a question. If a man is an infidel, what difference will it make whether he respect Sunday or not? Will the respect that he may have for Sunday atone for his unbelief? Perhaps there are not many who would answer this question in the affirmative, and yet it is the position that thousands of professed Christians really hold. There is a society called the "National Reform Association," which puts a premium on just such religion as that. To have Sunday kept strictly is really the one great point for which they labor. Says its organ, concerning some officials twh travel on Sunday, "Not one of those men is fit to hold office in the nation." It would introduce a new kind of civil service reform.

And make one's zeal for the Sunday, and his strictness in observing it, the test of his fitness for office. Now when that party gets strong enough to dictate to the nation, how long will it be before every *politician*, whether infidel or Jew, will be a strict Sunday-keeper? Not long; and by the National Reform Association this will be counted to them for righteousness. Yet these same people charge Adventists with having no religion but the Sabbath. *SITI January 22, 1885, page 56.7*

A frequent charge against Seventh-day Adventists is that they destroyed people's confidence in the Sunday Sabbath, and do not succeed in persuading them to keep Saturday. It is claimed that these people are left in a worse condition than they were before, and that therefore the work of Seventh-day Adventists is wholly bad. The charge is not true. As we before stated, the number of Sabbath-keepers is being daily increased; and these accessions, from the ranks of infidelity as well as from those who have always revered the Bible, and who have walked in all the light that they had. But not all that hear the truth obey. Now are these in a worse condition than before? Undoubtedly; a man cannot reject light with impunity. The preaching of Christ, while it won some, hardened others. He himself said, "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin; but now they have no cloak for their sin." *John 15:22*. Will our friends charge Christ with doing a bad work because he left some people worse than they were before? *SITI January 22, 1885, page 56.8*

And yet, in the particular case under consideration, we doubt if persons are made any worse by losing faith in the supposed sacredness of Sunday, even if they do not accept the true Sabbath. Is one error better than another? We know that it is a grievous sin for a man to refuse to regard any day as a holy, when the Lord has said, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy;" but is that man disobeying God any more than the one who not only deliberately refuses to obey the command of the Lord, but who shows his contempt for that command by doing something exactly the opposite? We would not wish to occupy the position of either one. Here is a father who has two sons. One of them hears his father's wishes and commands, and then invariably goes contrary to them, and the other refuses to do anything; would you say that the first is

better than the second? Would you not rather say that both are bad and deserving of punishment?*SITI January 22, 1885, page 56.9*

Take the first commandment. Our friends can use their reason in regard to this commandment, because their own interests are not directly affected by it. But there are millions who now practice the grossest form of idolatry. Now it is a fact that thousands who hear the teaching of the missionaries, never accept it. Take the Japanese, for instance. As a nation they are idolaters. Much missionary work has been done among them, and now Christianity is tolerated in Japan. There are many Japanese Christians, many native Japanese who are preaching the gospel to their fellow-men. But we now find that of the educated Japanese the great majority are infidels. This is a noted fact. They look on the worship of God and the worship of idols with equal disdain. Why is this? They have been led to see something of the foolishness of worshiping gods of wood or bronze, and have gone to the other extreme, believing in nothing. Shall we call back the missionaries from Japan? Shall we conclude that they are doing a bad work? Will our opposers say that it would be better to let all the Japanese remain heathen than to convert a few at the expense of making the rest infidels? Is it better to worship a log of wood than to worship nothing? To all these questions we think we hear an emphatic, No. Better that a few be saved than that all perish.*SITI January 22, 1885, page 57.1*

We would that all could see this matter in its true light. We have known people who acknowledged that Saturday-the seventh day-is the only true Sabbath, but who thought that they would appease the wrath of God against their disobedience by keeping Sunday very strictly. How deceitful is sin! It blinds men so that they call evil good, and good evil. May the Lord enable our brother and many others who are in a like position, to realize that *obedience* is what is required, and that *all* stubbornness is iniquity and idolatry. E. J. W.*SITI January 22, 1885, page 57.2*

January 29, 1885

“Punishment of the Wicked—Continued” *The Signs of the Times*, 11, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—FEB. 28

1. What is given to those who believe on Christ? *John 3:36.SITI January 29, 1885, page 70.1*
2. What is to be the fate of those who believe not the Son?*SITI January 29, 1885, page 70.2*
3. What does the Psalmist say will be the result to the wicked, if the Lord's wrath is kindled only a little? *Psalm 2:12.SITI January 29, 1885, page 70.3*
4. Then what will be their condition if his wrath *abides* on them?*SITI January 29, 1885, page 70.4*
5. What contrast did the wise man make between the continuance of the righteous and that of the wicked? *Proverbs 10:25.SITI January 29, 1885, page 70.5*
6. With what words of the Psalmist does this agree? *Psalm 1:1-4.SITI January 29, 1885, page 70.6*
7. What is to be done with the chaff? *Matthew 3:12.SITI January 29, 1885, page 70.7*
8. To what other perishable substances are sinners compared? *Hosea 13:3.SITI January 29, 1885, page 70.8*
9. To what is their destruction compared? *Isaiah 5:24.SITI January 29, 1885, page 70.9*
10. How has the beloved disciple described the fate of the wicked? *Revelation 20:9.SITI January 29, 1885, page 70.10*

11. In what manner will they be devoured? *Nahum 1:10.SITI January 29, 1885, page 70.11*

12. Into what shall the wicked consume? *Psalms 37:20.SITI January 29, 1885, page 70.12*

13. Of what was man formed? *Genesis 2:7; 18:27.SITI January 29, 1885, page 70.13*

14. After the fire of the last day, what will the wicked be? *Malachi 4:3.SITI January 29, 1885, page 70.14*

15. In view of this fact, what does one of the prophets say of the wicked? *Obadiah 16.SITI January 29, 1885, page 70.15*

16. What corroborative testimony can you give on this point? *Psalms 37:9, 10.SITI January 29, 1885, page 70.16*

17. Quote another text which proves that a time will come when there will be no wicked in existence in the universe. *Revelation 5:13.SITI January 29, 1885, page 70.17*

18. Who is the author of the doctrine that the wicked shall not die? *Genesis 3:4.SITI January 29, 1885, page 70.18*

19. Who is the serpent? *Revelation 20:2.SITI January 29, 1885, page 70.19*

20. For what purpose did the devil invent that doctrine? *Ezekiel 13:22.SITI January 29, 1885, page 70.20*

If the reader will only take pains to look up the references given in this lesson, he certainly will not need comments to aid his understanding of the subject. Just note the strong expressions that are used concerning the wicked: They “shall not see life.” *John 3:36*. They pass away as does the whirlwind. *Proverbs 10:25*. They are “like the chaff which the wind driveth away.” *Psalms 1:4*. This chaff is to be burned up with a fire so intense that it cannot be extinguished. *Matthew 3:12*. “They shall be as the morning cloud, and as the early dew that passeth away, as the chaff that is driven with the whirlwind out of the floor, and as the smoke out of the

chimney." *Hosea 13:3*. "As the fire devoureth the stubble, and the flame consumeth the chaff, so their root shall be as rottenness, and their blossom shall go up as dust." *Isaiah 5:24*. "They shall be devoured as stubble fully dry." *Nahum 1:10*. They shall consume "into smoke." *Psalms 37:20*. "The day that cometh shall burn them up," and "they shall be ashes" under the feet of the righteous. *Malachi 4:1, 3*. "They shall be as though they had not been." *Obadiah 16*. "For yet a little while, and *the wicked shall not be*; yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place, and it shall not be." *Psalms 37:10*. *SITI January 29, 1885, page 70.21*

One who reads these texts may well wonder how those who profess to believe the Bible implicitly can hold to the doctrine that the wicked shall exist in torment to all eternity. That doctrine squarely contradicts every one of the texts which we have quoted. Yet the contradiction is no more emphatic than was the serpent's contradiction of the words of the Lord, when he said to the woman, "Thou shalt not surely die." *Genesis 3:4*. This was the origin of the doctrine of eternal life for the wicked. It is the only doctrine held by religionists, that can be traced *directly* to the devil. His object in inventing this doctrine was to induce Eve to transgress the command of the Lord; and it has been for the purpose of holding men in the bondage of sin, that he has kept the doctrine prominently before all mankind ever since. *SITI January 29, 1885, page 70.22*

In *Ezekiel 13:22* we have the testimony of the Lord on this subject. When threatening punishment upon certain evil ones, he says it is, "Because with lies ye have made the heart of the righteous sad, whom I have not made sad; and strengthened the hands of the wicked, that he should not return from his wicked way, by promising him life." Let us see how this result has been accomplished. *SITI January 29, 1885, page 70.23*

We do not know the exact motive of the one who introduced this doctrine of eternal life for the wicked, into the Christian church. It was no doubt mainly a result of his heathen training, and without any definite motive. But so far as he had any definite idea, it was designed to deter men from sin and to frighten them into repentance. This is why all denominations have advocated it in

times past. We have often heard it said by ministers, that if the doctrine of eternal torment were not preached, sinners would have no fear of the consequences of sin. Just as if the Lord did not know what he was about when he made *death* the penalty for sin! The Lord has said, "The wages of sin is death," and, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die;" but these persons say, in effect: "No, no, Lord; you must not tell people that for if you do they will all keep sinning." And so, making light of the real penalty, and ignoring the love of God as the great factor in turning men to righteousness, they presume to improve upon his word.*SITI January 29, 1885, page 70.24*

And so the doctrine of eternal torment was for many years taught in all its horrible enormity. People accepted it as the word of God, because the priests and ministers said that it was such. Thousands were frightened into a nominal profession of Christianity, and to the infliction of severe punishments upon themselves, thinking by so doing to avert the wrath of God. It is safe to say that no *real* converts were made in consequence of the propagation of this doctrine; but "the church" gained immense sums of money by the sale of "indulgences," or releases from punishment, to poor, deluded sinners; this money was spent by the popes in self-aggrandizement and riotous living, and the devil was doubtless satisfied.*SITI January 29, 1885, page 70.25*

But there was always a class of people who, believing that the word of God taught this horrible doctrine, repudiated the Bible entirely. They would have nothing to do with a book which taught, as they supposed, such barbarous cruelty. And thus the doctrine has fostered infidelity. Others believed the doctrine, and settled down into stolid indifference, while others determined to have as good a time as possible while they were on earth. The terrible French Revolution, when all religion was proscribed, and God and the Bible were insulted and ignored, was a recoil from this terrible doctrine of eternal torment. And now, in our day, we find that the church itself is passing from that extreme of error, to the other extreme. Instead of being the leading topic of sermons, as formerly, the doctrine of eternal torment is seldom mentioned. On the contrary hundreds, yes thousands, of ministers who are called "orthodox," openly hold that God will not punish anybody, or that if he does, it will only be

for a time, and that then all men will be restored to his favor. Now anybody who stops to think can see that if men believe this, there is absolutely no incentive for them to change their course of life. The fear of punishment has been taken away, and if they are taught that all men will ultimately be saved, whether they now wish to be or not, they can see no necessity for believing on Christ. And so we see the object that Satan had in the beginning is attained, the wicked are strengthened in their wickedness and carnal security, by the promise of life. The safest and the best way is to hold and teach only the simple truth, and leave the results with the Author of truth. E. J. W. *SITI January 29, 1885, page 70.26*

“How It Was Done, and Why” The Signs of the Times, 11, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

The Sunday-schools of the country are now engaged in studying the book of Acts, having recently begun with the twentieth chapter, where they left off six months ago. That chapter notes a certain meeting that was held by the disciples, on the first day of the week, and it was to be expected that many lesson commentators would make as much out of it as possible, to bolster up Sunday observance. In looking over the list, we find that they are all about the same. The following from the N. Y *Independent*, as of Dec. 25, 1884, is a fair sample of the whole:-*SITI January 29, 1885, page 72.1*

“At Troas we find the brethren assembled on a Sunday. Indeed the early churches there was an observance of the seventh day and the first day both. The observance of the seventh day has never been formally abrogated; but it died out gradually, as the converted Jew of to-day does not circumcise his children, though the command to circumcise has never been formally repealed. Among the converted Gentiles the Lord’s Day [by this term the *Independent* means *Sunday*, and not the *Sabbath*.] would naturally command a more general observance than the seventh day, and as Christianity ceased to make converts among the Jews, but increased among the Gentiles, the observance of the first day became general and that of the seventh was gradually discontinued.”*SITI January 29, 1885, page 72.2*

In nothing else would scholars, such as the editors of the *Independent*, tolerate jumping at conclusions in this way. A single meeting on the first day of the week is accepted as proof that Sunday was the regular day of worship among the early Christians. If this be logic, what conclusion must we draw from the fact that, beginning with the day of Pentecost, they held meetings every day? The Sunday controversy affords proof that the keenest logicians may be led by self-interest to take leave of logic, and reason like infants. Let us notice in detail the *Independent's* position on the introduction of the Sunday into the Christian church. *SITI January 29, 1885, page 72.3*

1. "In the early churches there was an observance of the seventh day and the first day both." Well, then, if we are to be guided by the *practice* of the early church, why do not all the churches now observe both days? Why is it that the *Independent*, which believes in following the example of the early church, has omitted one important item? One thing is certain: The *Independent* has no ground on which to condemn Seventh-day Adventists. It acknowledges that Christians generally have departed from the custom of the early church, which it regards as authoritative. For our part we make no claim to follow a certain course simply because someone did so long ago. The Scriptures are the only guide, and we can read them and understand them as well as people ever could. *SITI January 29, 1885, page 72.4*

2. "The observance of the seventh day has never been formally abrogated." But it was formally enjoined, and is therefore still binding. "Yet [the observance of the seventh day] died out gradually." Will the *Independent* please tell us what constitutes sin? Is it violation of law, or violation of *custom*? Among certain nations the worship of the true God gradually died out, until it ceased altogether. Must we conclude that in those countries the old law which says, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," is not binding? that the worship of titles is alright? Why cannot people remember that the command, "Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil," is for all time, and that wrong cannot be made right, no matter how many people practice it. The New Testament bears this testimony: "Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also *the law*, for sin is the transgression of *the law*." 1 John 3:4. Modern and

uninspired teachers would have us accept this version: "Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also *custom*; for sin is the transgression of *custom*." We do not accept this new version. "The older is better." If the law enjoining the observance of the seventh day has not been abrogated, then everyone who does not observe the seventh day is, to that extent, a sinner. With many, such action may be a sin of ignorance, but it is a sin nevertheless. *SITI January 29, 1885, page 72.5*

But the *Independent* claims to present a parallel to the neglect of Sabbath observance. It says: "It died out gradually, as the converted Jew of to-day does not circumcise his children, though the commandment to circumcise has never been formally repealed." If a text could be found which should say, "Sabbath-keeping is nothing," as *1 Corinthians 7:19* says of circumcision, how readily it would be quoted. Of circumcision Paul says: "For he is a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is all word and deed flesh; but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the Spirit, and not in the letter." *Romans 2:28, 29*. If now the *Independent* could find a text, saying, "For he is a Sabbath-keeper, who observes the seventh day; ... but he is a Sabbath-keeper, who observes the first day," then it would have as good ground for Sabbath desecration as it has for not practicing circumcision. The *Independent* well knows that there is no point of comparison between circumcision and the Sabbath. By the style of argument which it uses, every one of the precepts of the moral law may be trampled upon without sin. The Spiritualist says, "Whatever *is*, is right;" that is, custom and the inclination must be allowed to settle questions of right and wrong. "Oh, no, says the *Independent*, "You must not say so of everything; that is true only when applied to the fourth commandment." But it will not be long before Christian people who give a custom an inclination as reasons for disregarding the Sabbath of the Lord, will find the same argument thrown back on them concerning the sixth, seventh, and eighth commandments. Those who thus set at naught a portion of the law of God, are opening the flood-gates of the iniquity, and will certainly be responsible for the wickedness that follows. *SITI January 29, 1885, page 73.1*

3. "Among the converted Gentiles the Lord's Day [Sunday] would

naturally command a more general observance than the seventh day.” Of course it would; and so, likewise, falsehood, and demon-worship accompanied by licentious rites would *naturally* command more general observance than would the pure worship of Jehovah; but that would not make such practices right. In the last part of the paragraph quoted, the *Independent* has let us into the true secret of the change from the seventh to the first day of the week. The first day was the heathen festival day. Around that day clustered memories of wild revels in honor of their god; in fact, all their old religious prejudices were *naturally* in favor of that day, and as they increased in numbers until the true disciples became only a small minority, the old customs were indeed gradually brought in. And because a horde of them chose to call themselves Christians while retaining their heathen customs, Christians of to-day think that they must follow their example. Dr. Killen, in “The Ancient Church,” p. 440, gives us another custom for which these nominally converted heathen manifested a natural fondness. He says:-*SITI January 29, 1885, page 73.2*

“The code of heathen morality supplied a ready apology for falsehood, and its accommodating principles soon found too much encouragement within the pale of the church. Hence the pious frauds which were now perpetrated. Various works made their appearance with the name of some apostolic man appended to them, their fabricators thus hoping to give currency to opinions or practices which might otherwise have encountered much opposition. At the same time many evinced a disposition to supplement the silence of the written word by the aid of tradition.”*SITI January 29, 1885, page 73.3*

And the successors of those persons are now numbered by the million. Tradition is now exalted far above the law of God. Why do not the churches adopt lying as a Christian ordinance? It was practiced in the early church. To be sure there is a law against lying, and it was never formally abrogated, but the converts from among the Gentiles had a natural tendency to lie, and so a strict regard for truth began gradually to die out. If it is right to keep Sunday, then it is right to lie and deceive, for both practices stand on the same foundation, namely, the custom of the majority. Verily, “The customs of the people are vain.” E. J. W.*SITI January 29,*

February 5, 1885

“Punishment of the Wicked—Review” *The Signs of the Times*, 11, 6.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—MARCH 7

Review.

1. How many classes of people does the Bible recognize?*SITI February 5, 1885, page 86.1*
2. When will the final separation between them take place?*SITI February 5, 1885, page 86.2*
3. With what will the righteous be rewarded?*SITI February 5, 1885, page 86.3*
4. What will be done with the wicked?*SITI February 5, 1885, page 86.4*
5. What can you say of the comparative duration of the reward of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked?*SITI February 5, 1885, page 86.5*
6. What is to be the punishment of the wicked?*SITI February 5, 1885, page 86.6*
7. What is the agent in the destruction of the wicked?*SITI February 5, 1885, page 86.7*
8. How complete will be this destruction?*SITI February 5, 1885, page 86.8*
9. To what perishable material are the wicked likened? Quote texts.*SITI February 5, 1885, page 86.9*
10. What will be the effect of the wrath of God abiding on the wicked?*SITI February 5, 1885, page 86.10*

11. How can you harmonize the theory that you have advanced with *Mark 9:43*? *SITI February 5, 1885, page 86.11*

12. What is always accomplished by an unquenchable fire? *Matthew 3:12. SITI February 5, 1885, page 86.12*

13. Prove that *Revelation 20:10* does not contradict the doctrine that the wicked are to become utterly extinct. *SITI February 5, 1885, page 86.13*

14. Of how many deaths does the Bible speak? *SITI February 5, 1885, page 86.14*

15. Explain the distinction between the first and the second death. *SITI February 5, 1885, page 86.15*

16. State the origin and effect of the doctrine that the wicked are not to *die* for their iniquity. *SITI February 5, 1885, page 86.16*

17. What do you learn from *Revelation 5:13*? *SITI February 5, 1885, page 86.17*

Although the lesson this week is a review, which give a few notes for the aid of those who have not had the previous lessons. However much people may imagine that there is provision made in the gospel for people who are “as good as the average,” the fact remains that the Bible recognizes only two of classes, -the good and the bad. “See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil.” *Deuteronomy 30:15*. To be counted good, a person must keep all of God’s commandments; to be among the bad requires the breaking of no more than one. “He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not together with me scattereth abroad.” *Matthew 12:30*. In the battle of life there is no intermediate or neutral ground. *SITI February 5, 1885, page 86.18*

This is also evident from the account of the final separation. “When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory; and before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats; and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left.”

Matthew 25:31-33. The succeeding verses plainly tell the character of these two classes. The first class are they who have served the Lord; love for him has sanctified every effort of their lives, and they have obeyed this exhortation of the apostle: "Whatsoever he do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and to the Father by him." *Colossians 3:17*. The other class are they who have lived for self; even their deeds of kindness have been prompted by love of applause, and so have been nothing but manifestations of the evil in their hearts. To the first class it is said: "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." *Matthew 25:34*. To the other class it is said: "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." *Matthew 25:41*. *SITI February 5, 1885, page 86.19*

The comparative duration of the reward of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked is stated in *Matthew 25:46*. The Saviour closes his discourse with these words: "And these [the wicked] shall go away into everlasting on [eternal] punishment; but the righteous into life eternal." If there were no other text relating to this question, we should note that death is to be the final portion of the wicked. If it were not so, then the promise of eternal life to the righteous would not indicate any difference in the state of the two classes. But there is a contrast. The wicked shall go into *punishment*, but the righteous into *life*. No one who regards the Bible will say that both classes see this same award; but it is certain that the righteous are to have *life*. Now anything that is different from life must be death, therefore the wicked receive the sentence of death, which is executed. To show that this conclusion is sound, we have only to quote Paul's words: "The wages of sin is *death*; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." *Romans 6:23*. The Saviour said that the punishment of the wicked and the life of the righteous are both to be eternal; therefore we know that eternal life,-death from which there is no resurrection,-is the wages of sin. Paul says (*2 Thessalonians 1:7-9*) that the wicked shall be punished with "everlasting destruction," when the Lord Jesus is revealed from Heaven with his mighty angels in flaming fire; and both John (*Revelation 20:9*) and Malachi (*Malachi 4:1-3*), and many others state this destruction is to be by fire. *SITI February 5, 1885, page 86.20*

For the completeness of the destruction of the wicked, we can only refer the reader to a few texts, which required no interpretation. See *Psalm 1:1-4; 2:8, 9; 37:9, 10, 20, 38; Isaiah 5:24; Obadiah 16; Malachi 4:1-3; 2 Thessalonians 1:7-9; Revelation 20:9*, etc. David says that if the wrath of God be kindled but a little, its effect will be to cause the wicked to “perish from the way” (*Psalm 2:12*); when therefore it *abides* on the wicked (*John 3:36*), they will be, as Obadiah has said, “as though they had not been.” See Webster’s definition of “perish.” *SITI February 5, 1885, page 86.21*

In *Mark 9:43* the Saviour says that the wicked shall be cast into a fire that “never shall be quenched.” This, instead of contradicting the above statements, is the strongest confirmation of them. The effect of an “unquenchable fire” is to “burn up” that which is cast into it (*Matthew 3:12*); if the wicked were cast into any other kind of fire, their destruction would not be complete. “Everlasting fire” is fire whose effects are everlasting; it is like that which destroyed the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah. *Jude 7*. This was unquenchable fire, and resulted in the overthrow of those cities; it turned them to ashes. *SITI February 5, 1885, page 86.22*

We can only refer to the texts that answer question 13. See *Exodus 21:1-6*, where it is stated that under certain circumstances the Hebrew servant should serve his master “forever.” Of course this meant during his natural life. So, likewise, “forever,” in *Revelation 20:10* and similar passages, covers only the space of time that it is possible for persons to exist in “unquenchable fire.” See also *Isaiah 34* and *35*, where, after the land is described as burning and lying waste, so that none can pass through it “forever and ever,” it is described as blossoming and as the rose, and being inhabited by “the ransomed of the Lord.” *SITI February 5, 1885, page 86.23*

This death of which we have been speaking is “the second death.” *Revelation 21:8*. “In Adam all die,” both righteous and wicked, men and little children; and “so Christ shall all be made alive.” *1 Corinthians 15:22*. Christ does this for all, because no one is to blame for being the descendant of Adam, and thus mortal. When all have been made alive, it will be seen who are worthy to have life continued to them, and those who have died in their iniquity shall die the second time. *Ezekiel 18:26*. This is the death to which God

had reference when he said to Adam, "In the day that thou eat this thereof, thou shalt surely die." That penalty has never been executed; through the kindness of God in Christ the execution of the penalty was stayed, in order to give fallen man another chance for his life. Christ tasted death for every man, and those who accept his sacrifice will escape the penalty for sin, but upon those who do not, it will fall grievously. *SITI February 5, 1885, page 86.24*

The originator of the doctrine of life for the wicked, as we learn from *Genesis 3:1-4*, was the serpent, "which is the devil and Satan." *Revelation 20:2*. His object in teaching it to Eve was to lead her to sin. He made her believe that if she disobeyed God she would not suffer for it, but would be the gainer by it. It was a direct lie, and it had its designed effect. Ever since that time it has been repeated, and with the same result. Thus the Lord through his prophet rebukes those who "with lies" have made the heart of his people sad, and have "strengthened the hands of the wicked, that he should not return from his wicked way, by promising him life." *Ezekiel 13:22*. Reader, do you wish to be found on the devil's side, perpetuating his falsehood? E. J. W. *SITI February 5, 1885, page 86.25*

"Vice As an Aid to Virtue" The Signs of the Times, 11, 6.

E. J. Waggoner

A short time ago it was stated in the daily papers that Dunton C. Ross, a noted athlete and saloon-keeper, have announced his intention of leaving his present business and entering the ministry. To that, of course, no one offers an objection. We shall be pleased to see every saloon-keeper quit the business; even if he did not feel the necessity of disgorging his ill-gotten gains, society would be the better for a diminution in the number of plague spots. And the desire to enter the ministry is certainly a laudable one, provided the aspirant does not seek simply to make gain by his "godliness," or to gratify unholy ambition. Mr. Ross may be perfectly sincere; doubtless he is as honest in his purpose as he knows how to be, but we have our doubts as to his fitness for the position which he seeks. For a man to decide to enter the ministry, before his heart has been touched sufficiently to make him quit selling beer, looks to

us as though he was troubled with moral blindness. It is better for a man to become converted before he decides to enter the ministry, than to make such a decision and then be “converted.” In the former case there would be more hope of the conversion being genuine.*SITI February 5, 1885, page 88.1*

But that to which we wish to call special attention is the statement made by Mr. Ross, that he has learned many things in his career as a saloon-keeper and “sporting man,” which will be of material value to him in his work as a preacher. He thinks that, with his past experience, all he needs is a short course in theology, to prepare him for successful work. It is a deplorable fact that this idea obtains quite generally in the world. If a man has been a “rough,” people will flock to hear him were people by his “sad experience” as he tells how degraded he used to be; while the man who has from his earliest childhood endeavored to walk in the path of virtue, is thought to be deficient. It is no exaggeration to say that a large majority of people think that a career of vice is almost absolutely essential to fix one to be a teacher of morals. They did not formulate their ideas in words, but the thought is there. When they compare a teacher who has been brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, with one who has assiduously served the devil nearly all his life, there is a decision in favor of the latter. They almost wish that the first one could have had the advantage of at least a short course in crime, “would it have been such a benefit to him.”*SITI February 5, 1885, page 88.2*

Now the secret of this is found in the love which the natural human heart has for sin. Each heart has a natural tendency toward that which is evil. “Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies.” *Matthew 15:19*. There is a charm about the man who has distinguished himself among his vicious associates, which leads some to almost deify him; and this fascination is felt to a greater or lesser extent by every unrenewed individual. Let us examine this matter, and see if a man is really benefited as a teacher by having been familiar with all the details of vice.*SITI February 5, 1885, page 88.3*

Take, for instance, the teacher of youth in the high school or the

college. Of two candidates for such a position, one of whom never learned to read until he was forty years of age, while the other has been a close student from his early years, and has always associated with the educated and refined, which would be chosen? Every committee would choose the latter, without hesitation. In so doing they would show wisdom. It is not denied that the first man might take a good teacher, but the question is, Can he teach as well as he could if in his youth he had trained his mind to think? Is his previous ignorance a recommendation? There can be no difference of opinion as to the answer. *SITI February 5, 1885, page 88.4*

Suppose I am to make a trip into the mountains, and was to secure a competent guide. Shall I accept a man whose principal recommendation is that he is thoroughly familiar with all the streets and alleys of the city, and who has never been in the country? Not by any means. The hardy mountaineer is the one whom I will choose. I care not if he knows nothing about the city where I live. What I want is that he shall be familiar with the place to which I am going. He cannot guide me if he has not been there himself. *SITI February 5, 1885, page 88.5*

The same rule will apply to religious teachers. A man may know all about the paths of vice, and the steps that takes hold on hell, but that is not the kind of instruction that people need. They know enough in that direction; and many will go that way fast enough without any instruction. What they do need is to be led into wisdom's way, to learn the ways of peace, and to know the love of that passeth knowledge. Who shall lead them there? Shall it not be the man who has walked in those ways himself, and who has been with Jesus? Reason would answer, Yes. No amount of argument can convince us that Ahab could ever have developed into a teacher that would compare with Enoch, who walked with God all his life. The best man that ever lived has enough of human nature to contend with to enable him to sympathize with the struggles of poor, frail sinners. We do not say that a good man is *best* fitted for a religious teacher, but that he is the *only* one for such a position. If he has at some time in his life followed vicious practices, the grace of God through Christ must remove the stains before he can render acceptable service to God. But he can never be the man that he would have been had he always lived an upright life. *SITI February*

5, 1885, page 88.6

This is a matter that should receive serious thought by our young men who are designing to work in the cause of God. You want to lead men to God; but you can never lead others there till you have been there yourself. You must *know Christ* before you can reveal him to others. This is *the essential* qualification. While you are striving for intellectual culture, do not neglect culture of the heart. It is right and necessary to improve the talent of intellect that God has given you; but at the same time let it be your chief aim to reach “the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ.” Remember that men who were ignorant of books have done noble service in the cause of God, but never one who was ignorant of Christ. Let these words of one who had fallen low in sin, be pondered by all:-*SITI February 5, 1885, page 89.1*

“Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me. Cast me not away from thy presence; and take not thy holy Spirit from me. Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation; and uphold me with thy free Spirit. *Then* shall I teach transgressors thy ways; and sinners shall be converted unto thee.” E. J. W.*SITI February 5, 1885, page 89.2*

February 12, 1885

“The Inheritance of the Saints” *The Signs of the Times*, 11, 7.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—MARCH 14

1. What is the meaning of the word “meek”? *SITI February 12, 1885, page 102.1*
2. Mention two individuals who possessed this grace in a remarkable degree. *Numbers 12:3; 1 Peter 2:21-23. SITI February 12, 1885, page 102.2*
3. How was the meekness of Christ manifested? *1 Peter 2:23. SITI February 12, 1885, page 102.3*
4. In thus meekly suffering injury, what did he leave us? *Verse 21. SITI February 12, 1885, page 102.4*
5. What should we do? *Ib. SITI February 12, 1885, page 102.5*
6. What will be done by all who abide in Christ, or, in other words, by all Christians? *1 John 2:6. SITI February 12, 1885, page 102.6*
7. Then what grace must characterize all Christians? *SITI February 12, 1885, page 102.7*
8. What is promised to the meek? *Matthew 5:5. SITI February 12, 1885, page 102.8*
9. By what other term are the meek referred to in this chapter? *Verse 3. SITI February 12, 1885, page 102.9*
10. What is promised to the “poor in spirit”? *SITI February 12, 1885, page 102.10*
11. What testimony does the apostle James bear on this point?

James 2:5.SITI February 12, 1885, page 102.11

12. What is an heir?*SITI February 12, 1885, page 102.12*

13. Then if the meek are “heirs,” what can you say as to the time of their receiving their inheritance?*SITI February 12, 1885, page 102.13*

14. What must the heirs pass through before they can receive the promised inheritance? *Acts 14:22.SITI February 12, 1885, page 102.14*

15. What class of people in this world are in the best condition? *Psalms 73:3-7.SITI February 12, 1885, page 102.15*

16. On further consideration, what did David see would be their end? *Psalms 73:17-19.SITI February 12, 1885, page 102.16*

17. How complete will be their destruction? *Psalms 37:10.SITI February 12, 1885, page 102.17*

18. What will then take place? *Verse 11.SITI February 12, 1885, page 102.18*

19. Then what must take place before the fulfillment of the promise in *Matthew 5:5*?*SITI February 12, 1885, page 102.19*

A meek man, according to Webster, is one who is “mild of temper; not easily provoked or irritated; given to forbearance under injuries; soft; a gentle; yielding.” The term is especially used of one who is submissive to the divine will; patient and gentle for religious motives. In *Numbers 12:3* it is plainly stated that “the man Moses was very meek, above all the men which were upon the face of the earth.” It is the prevailing impression that meekness is akin to effeminacy, and is worthy only of scorn; but if we recall the history of Moses, we shall see that such an idea is entirely erroneous. He was a great general, and the leader of mighty armies composed of fierce warriors. An effeminate man could have done nothing in the position of Moses, yet while Moses was leading the host of Israel, he was very meek. By reference to *Exodus 2:11-17*, it will be seen that Moses was naturally of a quick, impetuousness disposition, and

given to the resenting of injuries. His gentleness and forbearance were the result of communion with God. *SITI February 12, 1885, page 102.20*

No one could think of charging Christ with weakness in any particular, yet he was the embodiment of meekness. Peter describes the meekness that is acceptable to God: "For this is thankworthy, if a man for conscience toward God endure grief, suffering wrongfully. For what glory is it, if, when ye be buffeted for your faults, ye shall take it patiently? but if, when ye do well, and suffer for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God." *1 Peter 2:19, 20*. This grace is one of the most difficult to acquire, for it is most foreign to our nature. But Christ has set us an example, that we should follow in his steps, and he, the sinless one, "when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not." *1 Peter 2:23*. As the prophet said, "He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth; he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth." *Isaiah 53:7*. We cannot be Christians unless we are Christ-like; and if we are like Christ, we shall be meek. Therefore meekness is the characteristic of the Christian. *SITI February 12, 1885, page 102.21*

"Blessed are the meek, they shall inherit the earth." *Matthew 5:5*. Since all Christians, and none but Christians, are truly meek, this promise must apply to all Christians. In *Matthew 5:3* we read, "Blessed are the poor in Spirit; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." To be poor in Spirit is to be just the opposite of haughty, or, in other words, it is to be meek. So this promise is also to the meek. Now by comparing these two verses with *James 2:5*, we shall see that the same thing is promised both in the third and fifth verses of *Matthew 5*. The text referred to says: "Hearken, my beloved brethren, Hath not God chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he hath prepared to them that love him." *SITI February 12, 1885, page 102.22*

In this last text we find that those who are lovers of God, humble disciples of Christ, are *heirs* of a kingdom. *Matthew 5:5* shows that such shall inherit the earth, or, in other words, they are heirs the earth. The inevitable conclusion, then, is that the earth is "the

kingdom which God hath promised to them that love him.”*SITI February 12, 1885, page 102.23*

An “heir” is one who is entitled, either by birth, adoption, or special promise, to succeed to the possession of some property. But the heir is not in possession; when he comes into possession of his property, he ceases to be an heir. So if we speak of any one as being heir to a certain estate, it is understood that the time of his inheritance is still in the future. So the kingdom spoken of in *James 2:5* cannot be the gospel and its privileges, or the church, because those to whom the apostle speaks our brethren in the church, and already enjoying the blessings of the gospel. The kingdom which they are to receive is not yet in their possession, because, by virtue of their Christianity, they are *heirs* of it. Before they can inherit it, they must pass through great tribulation. *Acts 14:22.SITI February 12, 1885, page 102.24*

It scarcely needs any argument to show that the followers of God are by no means the possessors of this world. Christ says, “In the world ye shall have tribulation.” *John 16:33*. By the “world” is meant here, this present world; not the world in its redeemed state. And it often means wicked people. For proof of this, see *John 15:18, 19; 1 John 3:1*. Then Christ’s statement in *John 16:33* would imply that the wicked now have the ascendancy. It was the contemplation of this fact that caused David to almost lose faith in God. Said he, “I was envious at the foolish, when I saw the prosperity of the wicked. For there are no bands in their death; but their strength is firm. They are not in trouble as other men; neither are they plagued like other men. Therefore pride compasseth them about as a chain; violence covereth them as a garment. Their eyes stand out with fatness; they have more than heart could wish.” *Psalms 73:3-7*. In the twelfth verse he says, “Behold, these are the ungodly, who prosper in the world; they increase in riches.” These things well-nigh caused David’s steps to slip.*SITI February 12, 1885, page 102.25*

But when he went into the sanctuary of the Lord, then he understood the end of these prosperous ones. He saw that although they seemed so secure, their feet were set in slippery places. “Thou castedst them down into destruction. How are they brought into desolation, with terrors. As a dream when one

awaketh; so, O Lord, when thou awakest, thou shalt despise their image." *Psalm 73:18-20*. Here is brought to view the utter destruction of the wicked, concerning which we have learned in past lessons. The completeness of their destruction is thus stated by the psalmist: "For yet a little while, and the wicked shall not be; yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place, and it shall not be." *Psalm 37:10*. And when this destruction shall have been accomplished what will take place? "But the meek shall inherit the earth; and shall delight themselves in the abundance of peace." *Verse 11*. So we learn that this earth, the kingdom which is promised to them that love God, is not to be inherited until the wicked are consumed from off the face of it. Until that time, the meek are only heirs. E. J. W. *SITI February 12, 1885, page 102.26*

February 26, 1885

“Inheritance of the Saints.—Continued” *The Signs of the Times*, 11, 9.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—MARCH 28

No Authorcode

THE FIRST DOMINION FORFEITED

1. When the earth was created, to whom was given the dominion over it? *SITI February 26, 1885, page 134.1*

“And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.” *Genesis 1:26-28. SITI February 26, 1885, page 134.2*

2. What was its condition at that time? *SITI February 26, 1885, page 134.3*

“And God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good. And the evening and the morning were the sixth day.” *Genesis 1:31. SITI February 26, 1885, page 134.4*

3. Did man also share in this perfection? *SITI February 26, 1885, page 134.5*

“So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.” *Genesis*

1:27.*SITI February 26, 1885, page 134.6*

“Lo, this only have I found, that God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions.” *Ecclesiastes 7:29.SITI February 26, 1885, page 134.7*

2. What further shows that the dominion which God instructs to man must be preserved spotless?*SITI February 26, 1885, page 134.8*

“Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in Heaven.” *Matthew 6:10.SITI February 26, 1885, page 134.9*

“And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him.” *Daniel 7:27.SITI February 26, 1885, page 134.10*

5. Then until what time only, could Adam hope to retain the dominion given to him?*SITI February 26, 1885, page 134.11*

6. When the dominion was given to Adam, what prohibition was put upon him?*SITI February 26, 1885, page 134.12*

“But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.” *Genesis 2:17.SITI February 26, 1885, page 134.13*

7. Did he heed this prohibition?*SITI February 26, 1885, page 134.14*

“And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat.” *Genesis 3:6.SITI February 26, 1885, page 134.15*

8. Since the dominion given to Adam was a perfect one, what was the necessary result of his sin?*SITI February 26, 1885, page 134.16*

9. By what agency was Adam's fall accomplished?*SITI February 26, 1885, page 134.17*

"And the man said, The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat. And the Lord God said unto the woman, What is this that thou hast done? And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat." *Genesis 3:12, 13.SITI February 26, 1885, page 134.18*

10. Who is the serpent?*SITI February 26, 1885, page 134.19*

"And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years." *Revelation 20:2.SITI February 26, 1885, page 134.20*

11. Is a man is overcome by another, what is the result?*SITI February 26, 1885, page 134.21*

"While they promise them liberty, they themselves are the servants of corruption; for of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage." *2 Peter 2:19.SITI February 26, 1885, page 134.22*

12. By whom was Adam overcome?*SITI February 26, 1885, page 134.23*

13. Then to whom did he become subject?*SITI February 26, 1885, page 134.24*

14. What becomes of a man's possessions, if he himself is overcome by another?*SITI February 26, 1885, page 134.25*

"How can one enter into a strong man's house, and spoil his goods, except he first bind the strong man? and then he will spoil his house." *Matthew 12:29.SITI February 26, 1885, page 134.26*

15. Then when Adam was overcome by Satan, what must have become of the dominion which he held?*SITI February 26, 1885, page 134.27*

16. What *title* does Paul apply to the one who blinds men

concerning the gospel?*SITI February 26, 1885, page 134.28*

“But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost; in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them.” *2 Corinthians 4:3, 4.SITI February 26, 1885, page 134.29*

17. What is the *name* of the one who performs this work of deception?*SITI February 26, 1885, page 134.30*

“Even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, And with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved.” *2 Thessalonians 2:9, 10.SITI February 26, 1885, page 134.31*

18. Then who is “god of the world”?*SITI February 26, 1885, page 134.32*

19. What other title does Paul apply to the one who works in the children of disobedience.”*SITI February 26, 1885, page 134.33*

“Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience.” *Ephesians 2:2.SITI February 26, 1885, page 134.34*

20. Although Satan usurped the dominion from Adam, did he become absolute ruler?*SITI February 26, 1885, page 134.35*

“That they shall drive thee from men, and thy dwelling shall be with the beasts of the field, and they shall make thee to eat grass as oxen, and they shall wet thee with the dew of heaven, and seven times shall pass over thee, till thou know that the most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will.” *Daniel 4:25. E. J. W.SITI February 26, 1885, page 134.36*

“Mercy and Justice” The Signs of the Times, 11, 9.

E. J. Waggoner

It is quite generally held that and what is termed the old, or what is termed the Jewish, dispensation, God ruled according to a stern and justice, holding men to a strict account for everything; but that in the "Christian dispensation" mercy has predominated in his dealings with men; that justice has now stepped down from the throne, and that mercy has taken its place. This idea has taken almost universal hold on the minds of people. Let each reader examine his own mind, and he will find that some time in this life he has entertained this idea. We have before us a statement to this effect, made by a Doctor of Divinity, in the Sunday-school lesson notes of a prominent religious journal. The statement is as follows:-*SITI February 26, 1885, page 137.1*

"Since the days of Christ's assumption of the mediatorial power, 'old things are passed away, and all things are become new;' and souls are now saved only through the grace of Him to be in whom is to be a new creature."*SITI February 26, 1885, page 137.2*

This statement may be taken as a fair representation of the prevailing opinion. Let us examine the theory, and see how well it represents the God of the universe. On general grounds we should condemn it, because it is derogatory to the character of God. It represents him as a changeable being, one who is swayed at different times by different impulses; but we know that with him there is "no variableness, neither shadow of turning." The Lord says (*Ezekiel 18:25*) that his ways are equal; but this theory makes them decidedly unequal. As it is commonly held, it actually charges God with injustice; for the opposite of justice is *injustice*, and if at any time God should relax his justice, to that extent he would be unjust. No Christian would think of openly charging God with being unjust, yet this is exactly what is done by everyone who says that at the present time God dispenses mercy at the expense of justice.*SITI February 26, 1885, page 137.3*

This evidently erroneous position is taken as a consequence of the mistaken notion that strict justice and tender mercy are incompatible. It is because men have so perverted truth that justice is hated. In short, men regard justice as injustice. This idea carried out to its extreme, makes anarchists and nihilists,-men who regard justice as tyranny. We shall endeavor to show not only that justice

and mercy are compatible, but that they must exist together if they exist at all. That which would be mercy in a just man, is simply weakness and imbecility in an unjust man. God has always possessed both these attributes to exactly the same extent that he does now, and will possess them the same to all eternity. *SITI February 26, 1885, page 137.4*

When God had created the earth, beautiful and in every way perfect, he gave it to man. "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. *SITI February 26, 1885, page 137.5*

So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." *Genesis 1:26-28*. Adam was given dominion over the earth and all that it contained. That is, he was made its lord or ruler. The earth was to be his kingdom, he, of course, to be subject to the great Creator. *SITI February 26, 1885, page 137.6*

Since Adam was to be subject to God, there must of necessity be something to test his loyalty, and his fitness to be confirmed in the dominion that had been given to him in trust for the Lord. God created him for immortality (2 *Corinthians 5:4, 5*), but before he could be made immortal his worthiness for that inestimable boon must be proved. It never would have done to make man immortal, incapable of death, before his character was tested. That would have been taking the risk of perpetuating sin, the very existence of which God abhors. Should man prove unworthy, he would necessarily lose the dominion which had been intrusted to him; and since this great gift,-an eternal inheritance,-was to be the reward of his faithfulness, it was but fitting that a corresponding penalty should be administered if he should prove disloyal. Accordingly we find that God laid on him the following injunction, with the penalty attached:-*SITI February 26, 1885, page 137.7*

“And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.” *SITI February 26, 1885, page 137.8*

How long the man remained obedient, we have no means of knowing; but in the next chapter we find the record of his disobedience. And now, according to the previous declaration of God, in spite of Satan’s lie (*Genesis 3:4*), Adam must die. He must “pass from an animate to a lifeless state;” he must “cease to live;” he must “suffer a total and irreparable loss of action of the vital functions;” for that is what is signified by the word “die.” But “God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not *perish*, but have everlasting life.” *John 3:16*. Here the infinite mercy of God was displayed in the very beginning. Men had basically and ungratefully betrayed the trust given him; he had rebelled against God. He had surrendered to God’s enemy, and had thus become the enemy of God. *SITI February 26, 1885, page 137.9*

But God had no enmity in his heart toward man. He has no pleasure in the death of him that dieth (*Ezekiel 18:32*), and so he provided a way for man’s escape. In the statement that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent’s head (*Genesis 3:15*), there was the promise of the Messiah, by whose death men might become reconciled to God. *Romans 5:8-10*. The penalty was not revoked, but the execution of it was stayed, in order to allow all to lay hold on the means to become reconciled to God, if they chose to do so. That penalty still hangs over the human race; and since the Son of God was given so that those and only those who believe in him should not perish, it follows that the penalty will be allowed to fall upon those who do not believe in him. In proof of this Paul states that those who know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, “shall be punished with *everlasting destruction*.” *2 Thessalonians 1:7-9*. *SITI February 26, 1885, page 137.10*

The Bible reveals to us the sad fact that the number of the saved will be small in comparison with the number of those who will be lost. *Matthew 7:13, 14*. The vast majority of mankind have chosen

to remain in rebellion against God, yet there will be among the saved some of from “every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation.” There will not be one, however in all that vast throng, who has been saved in any other way than by belief in the only begotten Son of God, for he is the only way. “Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.” *Acts 4:12*. From the depths of his anguish Job exclaimed, “I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth.” *Job 19:25*. And Isaiah proclaims the glad truth that “he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed.” *Isaiah 53:5*. Although Isaiah wrote more than seven hundred years before the sacrifice was actually made, he could justly use the past tense, since the lamb was “slain from the foundation of the world.” *Revelation 13:8*. A promise from God, who cannot lie, is the same as though the thing were already performed. *SITI February 26, 1885, page 138.1*

Thus far God’s mercy. From the fall to the day of redemption it is the same. It was no less six thousand years ago than it is now, for it was then that Christ was given for man’s redemption. It was no light thing for God, who loves with an infinite love, to consent to deliver up his only Son to be insulted and murdered. But he made the sacrifice, and did it at a time when it was needed, when destruction to man was imminent. Now since there is in the universe no greater gift than the Son of a God, it follows that God gave at the first all that he had to give, and consequently it was simply impossible for any greater manifestation of his mercy ever to be made. And so the present dispensation contains no more mercy than there was in the patriarchal age. *SITI February 26, 1885, page 138.2*

No one can dispute these propositions. But some may say that God’s mercy will be suspended when, according to his word, he destroys the wicked. Few can see any mercy in the punishment of sinners, and many deny that there is in it any justice. We believe that there is both; that God’s justice, as well as his mercy, “endureth for ever.” *SITI February 26, 1885, page 138.3*

1. “Can God justly punish the wicked?” Certainly; because he has

said that he will, and said it before any sin had been committed. Then the question is really this: “Has God the right to attach a penalty to his laws?” The answer must be, He has such a right, if he has a right to make laws, for a law without a penalty attached is a nullity. A law, for the violation of which no penalty is provided, has no force, and is worth no more than the material on which it is written. Blackstone, the eminent jurist, whose “Commentaries” are standard authority in both hemispheres, says:-*SITI February 26, 1885, page 138.4*

“Of all the parts of the law, the most effectual is the *vindictory*. For it is but lost labor to say, ‘Do this for that,’ unless we also declare, ‘This shall be the consequence of your non-compliance.’ We must therefore observe that the main strength and force of a law consists in the penalty attached to it.”-*Cooley’s Blackstone, Vol. p. 55.SITI February 26, 1885, page 138.5*

That God has a right to make laws for his creatures, follows from the very fact that he is the Creator of all things. Any individual has a right to make laws for another just to the extent that that other is dependent on him. Now since in God “we live, and move, and have our being” (*Acts 17:28*), and are entirely dependent on him, it follows that he has, by right, the supreme control of us. Not only has he the right to make laws for his creatures, but he is bound to do so; for no intelligent creature can exist unless they have respect to some common standard. There must be something to regulate their actions, otherwise they would encroach upon each other’s rights, even if they had no malice in their hearts, and confusion if not extermination would be the result. This standard is called law. God is indeed the only one who can really make laws. Human laws derive their force from the fact that they are in harmony with the law of God. Blackstone says that we are in duty bound to violate any human law that runs counter to the law of God. The Bible teaches the same thing.*SITI February 26, 1885, page 138.6*

2. Since God has the right to make laws and to affix penalties, mercy as well as justice demands that those penalties be executed if the laws are violated. If God has brought subjects into existence, and has given laws for their mutual good, and for the maintenance of the rights of each, he is bound to support and protect those

subjects in the enjoyment of their rights. But if any one breaks the law, he destroys this evenly-balanced condition of things, and infringes directly on the rights of others. And now some of God's subject are being oppressed by the rebels. Shall he let them suffer? If he does, he will justly incur the charge of being unmerciful. He must punish the guilty, in order to assure the loyal ones of his power and his willingness to protect them. Should he allow the laws to be transgressed with impunity in one part of his Government, his subjects in another part would be in constant fear lest rebellion should spring up in the midst of them, and their lives thereby be endangered.*SITI February 26, 1885, page 138.7*

Take human laws for an example. Every civilized country has a law prohibiting murder. Now suppose there is a country which never punishes the murderer, what will be the result? The people will either take the laws into their own hands, or else they will flock to a country where their lives will be protected. People instinctively recognize the fact that there is no safety except in the enforcement of the laws, and the punishment of evil-doer; and a Government which does not do this, receives nothing but contempt, and soon ceases to exist.*SITI February 26, 1885, page 138.8*

This enables us to understand *Psalms 136*. The psalmist says: "O give thanks unto the Lord; for he is good: for his mercy endureth for ever.... To him that smote Egypt in their firstborn; for his mercy endureth for ever; and brought out Israel from among them; for his mercy endureth for ever," etc. The Egyptians were fearfully wicked. They were in rebellion against God, and were wickedly oppressing his people. They had received warning after warning, but to no purpose. For God to leave Israel in that hard bondage, would have been cruel. But the Egyptians would not let them go until they were forced to do so by the severe judgments of God. The Egyptians had, by their obstinate and insolent rebellion, forfeited all claim upon God, and his mercy was displayed in a remarkable manner in the deliverance of his people. And so God's mercy will be shown even in the final destruction of sin and sinners. By that act he will show his loyal subjects in all of his dominion that he has a care for their welfare, and will protect them. His mercy endures just the same, even while he is punishing the guilty; they, however, have voluntarily rejected it.*SITI February 26, 1885, page 138.9*

One more question will arise in the minds of some. It is this: "Why did not God destroy the wicked ones in the beginning, when the first sin was committed, and then create a new race?" That would have been allowing Satan to triumph, and besides, the new race would also have been obliged to stand a probation, and would have been as liable to fall as was the first. But the great reason is found in God's love to the creatures of his hand. "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." *John 3:16*. They who ask why God did not at once destroy the sinner, have a very limited idea of the love which God has for his creatures. That millions will finally be destroyed, is not the fault of God, but of man. God has done all that infinite love could do. There was no necessity for any to perish, for such was not God's will. *2 Peter 3:9. SITI February 26, 1885, page 138.10*

It must also be remembered that this earth is not the whole of God's dominion. We must not be so thoughtless as to suppose that this little world takes up all of God's attention. More than one world (*Hebrews 1:2*) owes its allegiance to the Maker of all. "The Lord hath prepared his throne in the Heavens; and his kingdom ruleth over all." *Psalms 103:19*. The telescope reveals worlds many thousand times as large as ours. And here, in this little speck of the universe, puny man has dared to lift up the standard of rebellion against God's Government! A wonderful and a horrible thing! Think of it; rebellion against God! Shall he put it down? Most certainly; the integrity of his Government demands it. In mercy and justice to his loyal subjects in other portions of the universe, he must show that he can and will maintain order. *SITI February 26, 1885, page 138.11*

But first he must let all see the terrible consequence of rebelling against his just decrees. Says Paul (*1 Corinthians 4:9*): "We are made a spectacle unto the world, and to angels, and to men." This is as true of all the world as it is of the apostles. While all the creatures in the universe behold the wonderful spectacle of one province (so to speak) in rebellion, they learn "that it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God;" and that God will "by no means clear the guilty;" and thus, while they learn to trust more fully in his protecting arm, and praise him for his mercy, they are effectually deterred from ever presuming to rise up against him. As

God permits the rebellion to fully develop itself, they see the terrible hideousness of sin, and the justice of God in finally blotting it from his universe. And when this shall have been accomplished, "every creature which is in Heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them," will with glad accord join in ascribing "blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever." E. J. W. *SITI February 26, 1885, page 138.12*

March 19, 1885

“Inheritance of the Saints” *The Signs of the Times*, 11, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—APRIL 21

1. What did Adam lose by his transgression?*SITI March 19, 1885, page 182.1*

2. By whom is the dominion to be restored?*SITI March 19, 1885, page 182.2*

3. State another result of Adam’s transgression?*SITI March 19, 1885, page 182.3*

“Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.”
Romans 5:12.SITI March 19, 1885, page 182.4

4. Who has the power of death?*SITI March 19, 1885, page 182.5*

“Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil.”
Hebrews 2:14.SITI March 19, 1885, page 182.6

5. Then what did Adam receive from Satan as the price of his dominion?*SITI March 19, 1885, page 182.7*

6. What, then, was the curse which Adam’s sin brought on the human race?*SITI March 19, 1885, page 182.8*

“Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.”
Romans 5:12.SITI March 19, 1885, page 182.9

7. Besides recovering the lost dominion, what else does Christ do

for man?*SITI March 19, 1885, page 182.10*

“But is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel.” *2 Timothy 1:10.SITI March 19, 1885, page 182.11*

8. By what means does Christ destroy death?*SITI March 19, 1885, page 182.12*

“Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil.” *Hebrews 2:14.SITI March 19, 1885, page 182.13*

9. Who alone are freed from the curse?*SITI March 19, 1885, page 182.14*

“He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.” *John 3:36.SITI March 19, 1885, page 182.15*

10. In consequence of Adam’s sin, what was pronounced upon the earth?*SITI March 19, 1885, page 182.16*

“And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life.” *Genesis 3:17.SITI March 19, 1885, page 182.17*

11. What was this curse?*SITI March 19, 1885, page 182.18*

“Thorns and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field.” *Genesis 3:18.SITI March 19, 1885, page 182.19*

12. In order to redeem man from *his* curse, what was it necessary for Christ to undergo?*SITI March 19, 1885, page 182.20*

13. Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made

a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." *Galatians 3:13.SITI March 19, 1885, page 182.21*

13. Then if Christ redeems the earth from *its* curse, what must he bear?*SITI March 19, 1885, page 182.22*

14. How and when did Christ bear the curse of the earth?*SITI March 19, 1885, page 182.23*

"And when they had platted a crown of thorns, they put it upon his head, and a reed in his right hand: and they bowed the knee before him, and mocked him, saying, Hail, King of the Jews! And they spit upon him, and took the reed, and smote him on the head." *Matthew 27:29, 30.SITI March 19, 1885, page 182.24*

In the beginning, as we have seen, the dominion over the whole earth was given to Adam. The earth was then "very good." It was as good as it could be. There was upon it no taint of sin. So the dominion which God gave to Adam was not over the earth merely, but over the *sinless earth*, *i.e.*, the earth unstained by sin. Then as soon as sin was introduced, that dominion was necessarily lost. Satan was the one who induced man to sin, and therefore he usurped the dominion, and obtained the title of "god of this world." The 'first dominion,' however, is to be restored. *Micah 4:8*. Evidently the one who overthrows the usurper, will be the one to restore the dominion. Now Christ was manifested that he might destroy the devil and his works. *Genesis 3:15; Hebrews 2:14*. Therefore Christ is the one who is to restore the lost dominion over the earth. That Christ is to possess the earth is plainly stated in *Psalms 2:7, 8.SITI March 19, 1885, page 182.25*

By his sin, Adam not only lost the dominion for himself, but he made it impossible for any of his posterity to possess it. For since it was forfeited through sin, his descendants could not possess it, because they were born sinful. Moreover his whole posterity were, with himself, doomed to death. Satan has the power of death (*Hebrews 2:14*), and since he induced our first parents to sin, that he might get the dominion, it follows that they gave it up in exchange for death. Death was the price that they received for the earth. This was the curse which came upon man, and from which Christ came to redeem us. Through death he abolishes death, and brings life

and immortality to light. *Hebrews 2:14; 2 Timothy 1:10*. All who have Christ (*John 3:36*) have life, and thus become free from the curse. Christ is our life. *Colossians 3:4*. *SITI March 19, 1885, page 182.26*

But it was not man alone that Christ came to redeem. He came "to seek and to save that which was lost." *Luke 19:10*. But the earth, as well as man, was lost. Because of Adam's sin, the curse passed upon the earth. This curse was that it should bring forth thorns and thistles. *Genesis 3:17, 18*. In order to redeem man from the curse, Christ was made a curse. He suffered death, that he might redeem at banned from the power of death. In like manner, that he might redeem the earth, he must bear the curse under which it groaned, and which was taking its life. So when he was about to die, his tormentors placed upon his brow a crown of thorns (*Matthew 27:29, 30*), and he thus bore at the same time the curse of the earth and the curse of men. By this he gained the right to redeem both. E. J. W. *SITI March 19, 1885, page 182.27*

March 26, 1885

“Inheritance of the Saints. Promises to Abraham” The Signs of the Times, 11, 13.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—APRIL 15

No Authorcode

PROMISES TO ABRAHAM

1. When did the Lord first appear to Abraham?*SITI March 26, 1885, page 198.1*

“And he said, Men, brethren, and fathers, hearken: The God of glory appeared unto our father Abraham, when he was in Mesopotamia, before he dwelt in Charran.” *Acts 7:2.SITI March 26, 1885, page 198.2*

2. What did he then say to him?*SITI March 26, 1885, page 198.3*

“And said unto him, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and come into the land which I shall show thee.” *Acts 7:3.SITI March 26, 1885, page 198.4*

3. To what place did Abraham go from Mesopotamia?*SITI March 26, 1885, page 198.5*

“Then came he out of the land of the Chaldaeans, and dwelt in Charran; and from thence, when his father was dead, he removed him into this land, wherein ye now dwell.” *Acts 7:4.SITI March 26, 1885, page 198.6*

4. How long did Abraham stay in Charran (Haran)?*Ib.SITI March 26, 1885, page 198.7*

5. After the death of his father, where did he go? *Ib.SITI March 26, 1885, page 198.8*

6. Locate, as nearly as possible, all these places on the map.*SITI March 26, 1885, page 198.9*

7. Where do you find the record of these events of which Stephen speaks? *Genesis 12:1-5.SITI March 26, 1885, page 198.10*

8. How old was Abram when he went into the land of Canaan?*SITI March 26, 1885, page 198.11*

“So Abram departed, as the Lord had spoken unto him; and Lot went with him: and Abram was seventy and five years old when he departed out of Haran.” *Genesis 12:4.SITI March 26, 1885, page 198.12*

9. How old was he when his father died?*SITI March 26, 1885, page 198.13*

10. When the Lord told Abram to leave his native country, what promise did he make?*SITI March 26, 1885, page 198.14*

“And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing; and I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee; and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.” *Genesis 12:2, 3.SITI March 26, 1885, page 198.15*

11. What expression shows that this promise was not merely a local affair?*SITI March 26, 1885, page 198.16*

12. How extensive was it?*SITI March 26, 1885, page 198.17*

13. What will be the condition of the world when this promise meets its fulfillment?*SITI March 26, 1885, page 198.18*

14. Who are they who are blessed?*SITI March 26, 1885, page 198.19*

“Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the

scornful. But his delight is in the law of the Lord; and in his law doth he meditate day and night.” *Psalm 1:1, 2.SITI March 26, 1885, page 198.20*

15. Then what will all the world do when this promise is fulfilled?*SITI March 26, 1885, page 198.21*

16. And when God’s will is thus perfectly performed, what will be on this earth?*SITI March 26, 1885, page 198.22*

“Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done in earth, as it is in Heaven.” *Matthew 6:10.SITI March 26, 1885, page 198.23*

The answer to question 9 will be readily seen by those who connect *Genesis 12:4* with *Acts 7:4*. He went out of Charran [or Haran] into Canaan when his father was dead, says Stephen. Moses says that he was seventy-five years old when he went into Canaan. So he was seventy-five years old, and his father died.*SITI March 26, 1885, page 198.24*

From a single expression in the promise contained in *Genesis 12:2, 3*, we know that it was not a local affair. That expression is this; “In thee shall *all the families of the earth* be blessed.” It embraces all the inhabitants of the earth. But it is not fulfilled until all the inhabitants of the earth are *blessed*. That condition does not now exist, and has never yet existed. Now we learn in *Psalm 1:1, 2* who are blessed,-those who love and obey the law of God. Of course; if the curse came because of *sin*, the blessing will come only when there is obedience. Therefore, when this promise is fulfilled, and every inhabitant of the earth will be delighting in the law of the Lord. In harmony with this are the words of Christ in his prayer (*Matthew 6:10*), showing that such a state exists only when the kingdom of God exists on earth. E. J. W.*SITI March 26, 1885, page 198.25*

April 2, 1885

“Inheritance of the Saints. Promises to Abraham.—Continued” The Signs of the Times, 11, 14.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—MAY 2

No Authorcode

PROMISES TO ABRAHAM.—CONTINUED

1. Under what circumstances was the promise first made to Abraham?*SITI April 2, 1885, page 214.1*

2. Repeat this promise?*SITI April 2, 1885, page 214.2*

“And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing; and I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.” *Genesis 12:2, 3.SITI April 2, 1885, page 214.3*

3. What condition of things will exist when this is fulfilled?*SITI April 2, 1885, page 214.4*

4. What scripture contains additional features of the promise?*SITI April 2, 1885, page 214.5*

“And the Lord said unto Abram, after that Lot was separated from him, Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward; for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever. And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth: so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered. Arise, walk through the land in the length of it and in the breadth of it; for I will give it unto thee.” *Genesis 13:14-17.SITI April*

2, 1885, page 214.6

5. When was this promise made? *SITI April 2, 1885, page 214.7*

“And the Lord said unto Abram, after that Lot was separated from him, Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward.” *Genesis 13:14.SITI April 2, 1885, page 214.8*

6. What did the Lord promise at this time? *SITI April 2, 1885, page 214.9*

“And the Lord said unto Abram, after that Lot was separated from him, Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward; for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever.” *Genesis 13:14, 15.SITI April 2, 1885, page 214.10*

7. To whom besides Abraham was the land promised? *Ib.SITI April 2, 1885, page 214.11*

8. How long was it said that they should have it? *Ib.SITI April 2, 1885, page 214.12*

9. How numerous did the Lord say his seed should be? *SITI April 2, 1885, page 214.13*

“And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth; so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered.” *Genesis 13:16.SITI April 2, 1885, page 214.14*

10. If his seed was to be “as the dust of the earth,” how much of the earth would it occupy? *SITI April 2, 1885, page 214.15*

11. Then to what was the promise equivalent? *SITI April 2, 1885, page 214.16*

12. How much territory does Paul say that the promise included? *SITI April 2, 1885, page 214.17*

“For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the

righteousness of faith.” *Romans 4:13*.SITI April 2, 1885, page 214.18

13. Why did the Lord make such great promises to Abraham?*SITI April 2, 1885, page 214.19*

“Seeing that Abraham shall surely become a great and mighty nation, and all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him? For I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment; that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him.” *Genesis 18:18, 19*.SITI April 2, 1885, page 214.20

In our last week’s lesson we learned that the first promise was made to Abraham while he was in his native country, when God told him to go out into a land which he should show him. *Genesis 12:1-3*. We found that the promise affected not only Abraham, but all the people who should live at a certain time upon the earth; that at that time all would be blessed, and would, consequently, be keeping God’s commandments.*SITI April 2, 1885, page 214.21*

After Lot had separated from Abraham, we find the promise renewed, with some additional particular. This will be found in *Genesis 13:14-17*. There we find that land was promised to Abraham, and to his seed, and that it was to be theirs forever. In the sixteenth verse we learn that his seed was to be “as the dust of the earth.” This is but another way of saying that his descendants should fill the whole earth. That being so, it follows that the promise given at that time was that he and his descendants should possess the whole earth. In *Romans 4:13* we learn that this conclusion is correct. We must not fail to note, however, as recorded in *Genesis 18:18, 19*, that the Lord’s promise to make of Abraham a great nation, and the fact that Abraham would command his children and his household after him, that they should keep the way of the Lord. E. J. W.*SITI April 2, 1885, page 214.22*

April 9, 1885

“Inheritance of the Saints. Promises to Abraham.—Continued” The Signs of the Times, 11, 15.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—MAY 9

No Authorcode

PROMISES TO ABRAHAM.—CONTINUED

1. Repeat the promise made to Abraham after Lot had separated from him.*SITI April 9, 1885, page 230.1*

2. Where is this promise found?*SITI April 9, 1885, page 230.2*

3. What did this promise embrace?*SITI April 9, 1885, page 230.3*

“For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith.” *Romans 4:13.SITI April 9, 1885, page 230.4*

4. How great a posterity did the Lord say Abraham should have?*SITI April 9, 1885, page 230.5*

“And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth; so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered.” *Genesis 13:16.SITI April 9, 1885, page 230.6*

5. On another occasion, what did the Lord say of his posterity?*SITI April 9, 1885, page 230.7*

“And he brought him forth abroad, and said, Look now toward heaven, and tell the stars, if thou be able to number them: and he said unto him, So shall thy seed be.” *Genesis 15:5.SITI April 9, 1885, page 230.8*

6. Had Abraham at this time any children?*SITI April 9, 1885, page 230.9*

“And Abram said, Lord God, what wilt thou give me, seeing I go childless, and the steward of my house is this Eliezer of Damascus?” *Genesis 15:2.SITI April 9, 1885, page 230.10*

7. How did he regard this promise from the Lord?*SITI April 9, 1885, page 230.11*

“And he believed in the Lord; and he counted it to him for righteousness.” *Genesis 15:6.SITI April 9, 1885, page 230.12*

8. How did the Lord regard Abram’s belief?*ib.SITI April 9, 1885, page 230.13*

9. How old was Abram when the Lord next appeared to him?*SITI April 9, 1885, page 230.14*

“And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, the Lord appeared to Abram, and said unto him, I am the Almighty God; walk before me, and be thou perfect.” *Genesis 17:1.SITI April 9, 1885, page 230.15*

10. What part of the promise did the Lord at this time renew?*SITI April 9, 1885, page 230.16*

“And I will make my covenant between me and thee, and will multiply thee exceedingly.” “And I will make thee exceeding fruitful, and I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee.” *Genesis 17:2, 6.SITI April 9, 1885, page 230.17*

11. What name did the Lord at this time give him as a continual reminder of this promise?*SITI April 9, 1885, page 230.18*

“Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be Abraham; for a father of many nations have I made thee.” *Genesis 17:5.SITI April 9, 1885, page 230.19*

12. What is the meaning of “Abraham”?*SITI April 9, 1885, page 230.20*

“Father of a great multitude.” *Genesis 17:5*, margin. *SITI April 9, 1885, page 230.21*

13. What did the Lord at this time say he would give to Abraham and his seed? *SITI April 9, 1885, page 230.22*

“And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God.” *Genesis 17:8. SITI April 9, 1885, page 230.23*

14. How long did the Lord say they should possess this land? *ib. SITI April 9, 1885, page 230.24*

15. And how much land have we learned that they were to have? *SITI April 9, 1885, page 230.25*

16. On what condition was this promise given? *SITI April 9, 1885, page 230.26*

“And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, the Lord appeared to Abram, and said unto him, I am the Almighty God; walk before me, and be thou perfect.” *Genesis 17:1. SITI April 9, 1885, page 230.27*

17. Then to what other promise is this equivalent? *SITI April 9, 1885, page 230.28*

“But the meek shall inherit the earth; and shall delight themselves in the abundance of peace.” *Psalms 37:11. SITI April 9, 1885, page 230.29*

The promise made to Abraham after Lot separated from him, will be found in *Genesis 13:14-17*. It will be remembered that the promise embraced a grant of land, and this land, we learned (*Romans 4:13*), was the whole earth. In *Genesis 17:1-8*, we have the same thing repeated. At that time the Lord gave him his name, “Abraham,” meaning, “a multitude of nations,” or a “father of many nations.” This would serve to continually keep in mind the promise that his seed should be as the dust of the earth, and as the stars of heaven. God also at this time repeated the statement that he would give the

land (the earth) to Abraham and his seed for an “everlasting possession.” As noted in our last lesson, this promise was on condition that Abraham should walk perfectly before the Lord. Since a meek person is a follower of Christ, and therefore perfect, it follows that this promise is equivalent to that already learned in *Psalm 37:11*. E. J. W. *SITI April 9, 1885, page 230.30*

April 16, 1885

“Inheritance of the Saints. Promises to Abraham.—Continued” The Signs of the Times, 11, 16.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—MAY 16

No Authorcode

PROMISES TO ABRAHAM.—CONTINUED

1. After Abraham had obeyed the command to offer up Isaac, what did the Lord swear to do? *SITI April 16, 1885, page 246.1*

“And said, By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord, for because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son; That in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies; And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice.” *Genesis 22:16-18.SITI April 16, 1885, page 246.2*

2. How numerous did he say Abraham’s seed should be? *ib.SITI April 16, 1885, page 246.3*

3. Where have we found similar expressions? *SITI April 16, 1885, page 246.4*

“And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth; so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered.” *Genesis 13:16.SITI April 16, 1885, page 246.5*

“And he brought him forth abroad, and said, Look now toward heaven, and tell the stars, if thou be able to number them: and he said unto him, So shall thy seed be.” *Genesis 15:5.SITI April 16,*

1885, page 246.6

4. What did the Lord say that Abraham's seed should possess?*SITI April 16, 1885, page 246.7*

"That in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies." *Genesis 22:17.SITI April 16, 1885, page 246.8*

5. What is indicated by the statement that his seed shall possess the gate of his enemies"?*SITI April 16, 1885, page 246.9*

6. Then with what other scriptures already learned, is this parallel?*SITI April 16, 1885, page 246.10*

"And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee; and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." *Genesis 12:3.SITI April 16, 1885, page 246.11*

"For all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed forever." *Genesis 13:15.SITI April 16, 1885, page 246.12*

"For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith." *Romans 4:13.SITI April 16, 1885, page 246.13*

7. What further shows that the promise in *Genesis 22:16-18* is the same as those already learned? Compare *Genesis 22:18* with *Genesis 12:3; 18:18.SITI April 16, 1885, page 246.14*

8. Why did the Lord now say that he would do this thing?*SITI April 16, 1885, page 246.15*

"And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice." *Genesis 22:18.SITI April 16, 1885, page 246.16*

9. And what have we before found was the condition on which the promise was based?*SITI April 16, 1885, page 246.17*

“For I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment; that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him.” *Genesis 18:19.SITI April 16, 1885, page 246.18*

10. What did Stephen say as to the fulfillment of the promise recorded in *Genesis 13:15; 17:18?SITI April 16, 1885, page 246.19*

“And he gave him none inheritance in it, no, not so much as to set his foot on; yet he promised that he would give it to him for a possession, and to his seed after him, when as yet he had no child.” *Acts 7:5.SITI April 16, 1885, page 246.20*

11. What do we know concerning all of God’s promises?*SITI April 16, 1885, page 246.21*

“The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is longsuffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance.” *2 Peter 3:9.SITI April 16, 1885, page 246.22*

“For all the promises of God in him are yea, and in him Amen, unto the glory of God by us.” *2 Corinthians 1:20.SITI April 16, 1885, page 246.23*

12. Then what must we conclude concerning these promises to Abraham?*SITI April 16, 1885, page 246.24*

“Thy seed shall possess of the gate of his enemies.”*Genesis 22:17.* Ancient cities, as is well known, were surrounded by walls, and the only means of entrance was by means of gates, which were well guarded. Whoever controlled those gates, controlled the city. If an enemy could gain possession of the gates of a city, they could keep the inhabitants closely confined within, or could admit whomsoever they chose. So to possess the gate of one’s enemies would signify supreme rule. When it was promised that Abraham’s seed should “possess the gate of his enemies,” we understand that his seed was eventually to occupy all the territory then occupied by those who were antagonistic to him. But this was equivalent to the inheritance of the earth, thus showing that this text is parallel with *Genesis*

12:13; 13:15; *Romans 4:13*, which have already been considered.*SITI April 16, 1885, page 246.25*

Notwithstanding these promises, which were made to Abraham as well as to his seed, Abraham died without seeing their fulfillment. Stephen says that God did not give him enough of the land to set his foot on, although he promised that he would give him the whole of it. But we know that the Lord is not slack concerning his promises, and that all his promises are yea and amen; they cannot be broken. Every one will be fulfilled to the letter. This being the case, we must conclude that the Lord did not intend that Abraham should receive the inheritance immediately, but that the promise should be fulfilled to him at some future time. When we read that Abraham died "*in faith*," although he had not received the inheritance, we know that this was the way he understood the Lord. Had Abraham not thus understood the Lord, he would have died discourage, instead of "*in faith*." E. J. W.*SITI April 16, 1885, page 246.26*

May 7, 1885

“College Notes” *The Signs of the Times*, 11, 19.

E. J. Waggoner

On Monday, April, 20 a most interesting meeting in the interest of the school was held in the College chapel. Since it was not the regular stockholders’ meeting, the financial report was only approximate, but all were surprised at the good showing. Of this, however, we shall speak more particularly next week, when we shall have the report of the stockholders’ meeting. That which contributed most to the interest of the meeting, and of which we wish to speak, is the experiences that were given by some of the students. Remarks being in order, after the teachers had spoken concerning the work of the last term, and the prospects for the future, one young man arose and said that he owed a debt of gratitude to the College, which she could never repay. He knew that the College did not advertise to be a sanitarium, yet it had been such to him, during his two years’ attendance. He said that his health was so poor when he entered that he should have been obliged to leave in a short time, if it had not been for the regular hours, and the physical exercise in the industrial department. *SITI May 7, 1885, page 281.1*

One who has attended during the last school year, spoke very feelingly of the pleasant associations formed, and the previous religious privileges he had enjoyed while trying to gain knowledge. *SITI May 7, 1885, page 281.2*

Another said that he had gained both spiritually and intellectually. The North College Hall had been to him *a home*, and he felt that it would be a pleasure for him to work for the school. *SITI May 7, 1885, page 281.3*

One young man said that he was in very poor when he left home last fall, and that his friends had tried to discourage him. Now his health is good, his mind stronger, and his open bright. *SITI May 7, 1885, page 281.4*

Still another, who has spent two winters at the College, and has already done some good work in the missionary field, said that if he has any success in life, the founders of the College will receive a large portion of the reward.*SITI May 7, 1885, page 281.5*

One young lady said that before she came to the College she had never done any work, did not know how, and did not want to. Now, besides what she had gained mentally, she had learned much about work, and what is more, had learned to like it.*SITI May 7, 1885, page 281.6*

Others spoke to the same effect. These utterances were spontaneous, and none who heard them could doubt their sincerity. If all the patrons of the College, and all who should be patrons, could have heard them, we are confident that the present accommodations would not be sufficient for half of those who would attend next term.*SITI May 7, 1885, page 281.7*

The industrial system of education is no longer an experiment so far as Healdsburg College is concerned. It is a decided success. There are many who think it would be a good thing if it could be carried out; but in this case the students take hold heartily to carry out. It would do one good to see the pride which, with very rare exceptions, the students taking in the College, and in preserving a neat and orderly condition about the premises. The visitors present at the meeting were pleased at the general appearance of things; but no one who has not been present, can have any idea of the amount of work that has been done by the students.*SITI May 7, 1885, page 281.8*

It was noticeable that nearly all of the students who spoke at the meeting, mentioned the fact that their health had improved. One of the brethren who has been a devoted friend of the school, and who was instrumental in securing the attendance of several students last fall, said that at first sight it was difficult for him to recognize some of them, because of their improved physical condition. This is an item upon which too much stress cannot be laid. There are many schools where students may rapidly gain knowledge from books, but there are few schools where they can at the same time steadily improve in health, and also learn how to preserve the health which

they have gained. Healdsburg College is one of these, and the only one with which we are acquainted.*SITI May 7, 1885, page 281.9*

We would not forget to mention the good feeling that has uniformly prevailed among the students. We believe that it would be a rare thing to find so many young people of different tastes and habits, brought together in one family without more or less discord. The fact that there was a perfect harmony was not because those present were naturally better than others, but because, with few exceptions, all were striving to live up to a high Christian principle. Much may also be credited to admirable tact and good management of those having charge of the "Students' Home." No family of six was ever better regulated than this one of sixty.*SITI May 7, 1885, page 281.10*

No one can fail to see the hand of God in the prosperity that has attended the Healdsburg College, and know that if with humble hearts we suitably acknowledge his blessings, it will be manifested in a more marked degree in the future. E. J. W.*SITI May 7, 1885, page 281.11*

June 4, 1885

“Inheritance of the Saints. (Continued.)” *The Signs of the Times*, 11, 22.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—JULY 4

No Authorcode

SOJOURNING IN A STRANGE LAND

1. What question did Abraham ask on one occasion when the Lord repeated the promise to him? *SITI June 4, 1885, page 342.1*

“And he said, Lord God, whereby shall I know that I shall inherit it?” *Genesis 15:8. SITI June 4, 1885, page 342.2*

2. What did the Lord say in reply? *SITI June 4, 1885, page 342.3*

“And he said unto him, Take me an heifer of three years old, and a she goat of three years old, and a ram of three years old, and a turtledove, and a young pigeon.” *Genesis 15:9. SITI June 4, 1885, page 342.4*

3. What did Abraham do? *SITI June 4, 1885, page 342.5*

“And he took unto him all these, and divided them in the midst, and laid each piece one against another; but the birds divided he not. And when the fowls came down upon the carcases, Abram drove them away.” *Genesis 15:10, 11. SITI June 4, 1885, page 342.6*

4. What happened when the sun was going down? *SITI June 4, 1885, page 342.7*

“And when the sun was going down, a deep sleep fell upon Abram; and, lo, an horror of great darkness fell upon him.” *Genesis 15:12. SITI June 4, 1885, page 342.8*

5. In this vision, what did the Lord say to Abraham?*SITI June 4, 1885, page 342.9*

“And he said unto Abram, Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years.” *Genesis 15:13.SITI June 4, 1885, page 342.10*

6. How long were his seed to be strangers in a strange land?*SITI June 4, 1885, page 342.11*

7. When the time was expired, what was to be done?*SITI June 4, 1885, page 342.12*

“And also that nation, whom they shall serve, will I judge: and afterward shall they come out with great substance.” *Genesis 15:14.SITI June 4, 1885, page 342.13*

8. What was the name of the land which they were to have as their own?*SITI June 4, 1885, page 342.14*

“And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God.” *Genesis 17:8.SITI June 4, 1885, page 342.15*

9. Why could Abraham not at once take possession of it?*SITI June 4, 1885, page 342.16*

“But in the fourth generation they shall come hither again; for the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full.” *Genesis 15:16.SITI June 4, 1885, page 342.17*

10. When the Lord did at last deliver the Israelites from bondage, what did he say to them?*SITI June 4, 1885, page 342.18*

“And Moses went up unto God, and the Lord called unto him out of the mountain, saying, Thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob, and tell the children of Israel; Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself. Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and

keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine; and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel.” *Exodus 19:3-6.SITI June 4, 1885, page 342.19*

11. What did he say they should be?*SITI June 4, 1885, page 342.20*

“And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel.” *Exodus 19:6.SITI June 4, 1885, page 342.21*

12. In making this promise, what was the Lord doing?*SITI June 4, 1885, page 342.22*

“For thou art an holy people unto the Lord thy God: the Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth. The Lord did not set his love upon you, nor choose you, because ye were more in number than any people; for ye were the fewest of all people; but because the Lord loved you, and because he would keep the oath which he had sworn unto your fathers, hath the Lord brought you out with a mighty hand, and redeemed you out of the house of bondmen, from the hand of Pharaoh king of Egypt.” *Deuteronomy 7:6-8.SITI June 4, 1885, page 342.23*

13. Then with what is *Exodus 19:3-6* parallel?*SITI June 4, 1885, page 342.24*

14. What was the condition of the promise to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob?*SITI June 4, 1885, page 342.25*

15. And what was the condition of this promise to the Jews?*SITI June 4, 1885, page 342.26*

“Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine.” *Exodus 19:5.SITI June 4, 1885, page 342.27*

“And he said unto Abram, Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years.” *Genesis 15:13*. The student must not forget the idea that this refers solely to the bondage in Egypt, for Paul tells us (*Galatians 3:17*) that from the announcement of the promise to Abraham until the giving of the law, at Sinai, was but four hundred and thirty years. This four hundred and thirty years is thus computed: From the giving of the promise until the birth of Isaac, twenty-five years (compared *Genesis 12:1-4* with *Genesis 25:5*); from the birth of Isaac until the birth of Jacob, sixty years (*Genesis 25:26*); from the birth of Jacob and till the going down into Egypt, one hundred and thirty years (*Genesis 47:8, 9*), making 215 years from the giving of the promise until the beginning of the sojourn in Egypt; and Josephus says (“Antiquities,” *chap. 15, 2*) that 215 years was the length of that sojourn. Thus the 430 years of *Galatians 3:17* and *Exodus 12:40, 41* are accounted for. *SITI June 4, 1885, page 342.28*

The text under consideration (*Genesis 15:13*), however, is more difficult. It is evident from the text, and also its parallel in *Acts 7:6*, that the four hundred years’ sojourn ends at the same time as the four hundred and thirty years’ sojourn, viz., at the deliverance from Egypt. Then the four hundred years’ of affliction (*Genesis 15:13*) must have begun thirty years after the giving of the promise. Dr. Clarke and others say that the mocking Ishmael when Isaac was weaned (*Genesis 21:1-10*), called persecution by Paul in *Galatians 4:29*, marks the beginning of the four hundred years. Isaac was born twenty-five years after the promise, and the age of weaning is placed at about five years (see Clark on *Genesis 21:8*), thus making the thirty years from the promise. *SITI June 4, 1885, page 342.29*

This is certainly not inconsistent with *Genesis 15:13*; for if Abraham’s seed was to be afflicted four hundred years, we would expect that persecution to begin with Isaac. The only difficulty remaining is to show the harmony of these texts with *Exodus 12:40, 41*, which speak of the *children of Israel* as sojourning four hundred and thirty years. But Dr. Horne (“Introduction to the Study of the Scriptures,” Vol. 1, part 1, chap 3., see vi.) says that the text, according to the ancient Samaritan Pentateuch, should read thus: “Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, *and their fathers*,

which they sojourned *in the land of Canaan and in the land of Egypt*, was four hundred and thirty years.” This rendering, which is confirmed by the Alexandrian manuscript of the Septuagint, makes perfect harmony. *SITI June 4, 1885, page 342.30*

From *Deuteronomy 7:6-8* we learn that when the Lord brought the Israelites out of Egypt, and made the promise recorded in *Exodus 19:3-6*, it was simply in keeping with the promise made to their fathers. The fact that the conditions of the two promises were the same (compared *Genesis 26:5* and *Exodus 19:5*) harmonizes with this statement. E. J. W. *SITI June 4, 1885, page 342.31*

June 11, 1885

“Inheritance of the Saints. (Continued.) The Promised Land” The Signs of the Times, 11, 23.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—JULY 11

No Authorcode

THE PROMISED LAND

1. When the Lord brought the children of Israel out of Egypt, what promise did he make them?*SITI June 11, 1885, page 358.1*

“And Moses went up unto God, and the Lord called unto him out of the mountain, saying, Thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob, and tell the children of Israel; ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles’ wings, and brought you unto myself. Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine; and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel.” *Exodus 19:3-6.SITI June 11, 1885, page 358.2*

2. Of what promise was this a continuation?*SITI June 11, 1885, page 358.3*

“For thou art an holy people unto the Lord thy God; the Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth. The Lord did not set his love upon you, nor choose you, because ye were more in number than any people; for ye were the fewest of all people; but because the Lord loved you, and because he would keep the oath which he had sworn unto your fathers, hath the Lord brought you out with a mighty hand, and redeemed you out of the house of bondmen, from

the hand of Pharaoh king of Egypt.” *Deuteronomy 7:6-8.SITI June 11, 1885, page 358.4*

3. Into what land were they to be brought?*SITI June 11, 1885, page 358.5*

“And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God.” *Genesis 17:8.SITI June 11, 1885, page 358.6*

4. Who led them into this land? Read *Joshua 1:1-6, 11.SITI June 11, 1885, page 358.7*

5. To whom did the Lord say he had sworn to give the land which Joshua was to divide among the people?*SITI June 11, 1885, page 358.8*

“Be strong and of a good courage: for unto this people shalt thou divide for an inheritance the land, which I swore unto their fathers to give them.” *Joshua 1:6.SITI June 11, 1885, page 358.9*

6. Cite the passages in which the promise was made to the fathers. *Genesis 12:1-3; 13:14-17; 15:1-16; 7:1-8; 22:15-18; 26:1-5; 28:10-15.SITI June 11, 1885, page 358.10*

7. Since the promise was made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in person, could the possession of the land by their descendants be a fulfillment of that promise? It evidently could not.*SITI June 11, 1885, page 358.11*

8. In making the promise to Abraham, what had the Lord said his seed should possess?*SITI June 11, 1885, page 358.12*

“That in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies.” *Genesis 22:17.SITI June 11, 1885, page 358.13*

9. Was this fulfilled when Joshua led the Israelites into Canaan?*SITI June 11, 1885, page 358.14*

“Yet the children of Manasseh could not drive out the inhabitants of those cities; but the Canaanites would dwell in that land. Yet it came to pass, when the children of Israel were waxen strong, that they put the Canaanites to tribute; but did not utterly drive them out.” *Joshua 17:12, 13.SITI June 11, 1885, page 358.15*

10. What is Paul’s testimony on this point?*SITI June 11, 1885, page 358.16*

“For if Jesus [margin, that is, Joshua] had given them rest, then would he not afterward have spoken of another day.” *Hebrews 4:8.SITI June 11, 1885, page 358.17*

11. Where do we find that “other day” mentioned?*SITI June 11, 1885, page 358.18*

“The stone which the builders refused is become the head stone of the corner. This is the Lord’s doing; it is marvellous in our eyes. This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it.” *Psalms 118:22-24.SITI June 11, 1885, page 358.19*

12. What day was it of which David spoke?*SITI June 11, 1885, page 358.20*

“(For he saith, I have heard thee in a time accepted, and in the day of salvation have I succoured thee: behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation.)” *2 Corinthians 6:2.SITI June 11, 1885, page 358.21*

13. Since another day was spoken of, what does Paul concede?*SITI June 11, 1885, page 358.22*

“There remaineth therefore a rest to the people of God.” *Hebrews 4:9.SITI June 11, 1885, page 358.23*

14. Who is it that leads the people into the true rest?*SITI June 11, 1885, page 358.24*

“Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls.”

Matthew 11:28, 29.SITI June 11, 1885, page 358.25

15. And who are they who are Christ's?*SITI June 11, 1885, page 358.26*

"And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."*Galatians 3:29.SITI June 11, 1885, page 358.27*

16. Then through whom is the promise to Abraham and his seed fulfilled? E. J. W.*SITI June 11, 1885, page 358.28*

"How Readest Thou?" The Signs of the Times, 11, 23.

E. J. Waggoner

There has been of late quite an interest raised over the question in a recent Sabbath-school lesson, as to how old Abram was when his father died. We will therefore quote a portion of one letter from a brother who requests an answer through the SIGNS, and the answer to it will serve for all. He says:-*SITI June 11, 1885, page 361.1*

"The idea was conveyed in the Sabbath-school lesson in the SIGNS, a few weeks ago, that Abram was seventy-five years old when his father died, and the subject was brought up in the school at---, which caused some comment.*SITI June 11, 1885, page 361.2*

"As well as I remember, the SIGNS stated plainly that he was at that age at the death of his father, and suppose the conclusion was gotten at in this way. In the last verse of *Genesis 11* we have an account of the death of Terah, Abram's father, and the *12th chapter* begins with what the Lord had told Abram in regard to leaving his father's house, etc., and says: 'So Abram departed, as the Lord had spoken unto him; and Lot went with him; and Abram was seventy and five years old when he departed out of Haran,' and as his father had died before he departed, he must have been seventy-five when his father died."*SITI June 11, 1885, page 361.3*

The brother has the idea exactly, and when we have read his words we wondered that there could be any question in his mind. But the

next few words of his letter show the cause of his difficulty. He continues-*SITI June 11, 1885, page 361.4*

“But right here is where I think the mistake is. The Bible does does say that Terah died before Abram left Haran, but, on the other hand, conveys the idea very strongly that he did not. It is true that the last verse of *chapter 11* gives an account of the death of Terah, and the first verse of *chapter 12* gives an account of what the Lord told Abram about leaving his country, but it does not say that it was after his father’s death that he told him this, or that he did not leave before his father’s death.”*SITI June 11, 1885, page 361.5*

And right here is where we would place several exclamation marks. It is strange that the brother should have forgotten or overlooked *Acts 7:2-4*, which was referred to in the same lesson, and which reads thus:-*SITI June 11, 1885, page 361.6*

“Men, brethren, and fathers, hearken: The God of glory appeared unto our father Abraham, when he was in Mesopotamia, before he *dwelt in Charran* [Haran], and said unto him, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and come into the land which I shall show thee. Then came he out of the land of the Chaldaeans, and dwelt in Charran; and *from thence, when his father was dead, he removed him* into this land, wherein ye now dwell.”*SITI June 11, 1885, page 361.7*

The question, then, is reduced to this simple proposition: Since Abram left Haran when his father died (*Acts 7:2-4*) and he was seventy-five years old when he left Haran (*Genesis 12:4*), how old was he with his father die? No great mathematical skill is required to solve this problem. This was about the order in which it was stated in the Sabbath-school lesson, if we remember correctly. We apprehend that the question concerning Abram’s age at the death of his father, was raised in order to see if those studying the lessons were in the habit of comparing scripture which scripture, and noting the bearing of one upon the other. It seems that in this case many did not do so.*SITI June 11, 1885, page 361.8*

What has thrown so many off the track is this: They read in *Genesis 11:26*, “And Terah lived seventy years, and begat Abram, Nahor, and Haran.” And in *Genesis 11:32* they read: “And the days of

Terah were two hundred and five years: and Terah died in Haran.” putting these two together, they say, “Why, of course Abram was 135 years old when his father died.” Thus they ignored the plain and positive statements of *Genesis 12:4* and *Acts 7:4*, by which we must be guided. The record does not say that Abram was born when his father was seventy-five years old. There are two statements in *Genesis 11:26*; one is that Terah lived seventy years without children, and the other is that he begat at Abram, Nahor, and Haran. We are not to suppose that these three sons were all born at the same time, anymore than we are to suppose when we read (*Genesis 5:7*), “And Seth lived after he begat Enos eight hundred and seven years, and begat sons and daughters,” that all his sons and daughters were born at one time. Neither is it necessary to suppose that Abram was the first-born. The youngest son, if he was the most noted, is very often named first. Thus, “Ephraim and Manasseh” is the order in which Joseph’s sons are usually named, although Ephraim was the younger. See *Genesis 41:51, 52; 48:17-20*. *SITI June 11, 1885, page 361.9*

For another illustration, see *Genesis 5:32*: “And Noah was five hundred years old; and Noah begat Shem, Ham, and Japheth.” The casual reader might suppose that these sons were all born to Noah at one time, and he would certainly suppose that Shem was the eldest, and Japheth the youngest. But by comparing *Genesis 9:22-24* with *Genesis 10:21*, we learn that Japheth was the eldest son, and Ham was Noah’s second son. He is mentioned first, because he is most worthy of note, as being the ancestors of Abraham. So it is in *Genesis 11:26*. Terah was seventy years old when the first of his sons was born; but this was not Abram, since he was not born until his father was 135 years old. (Compare the age of Abram at his father’s death, with *Genesis 11:32*.) He is, however, named first, because he was the only one of note among the sons of Terah. *SITI June 11, 1885, page 361.10*

We have not devoted so much space to this question because we thought it a matter of great importance that all should know just how old Abraham was at his father’s death, but to show the necessity of careful thought in studying the Scriptures. All the facts of any case do not always appear in a single passage, and different ones must be compared. One thing must always be borne in mind: Whenever

a thing is plainly stated in the text or must *necessarily* be concluded from a comparison of two or more positive statements, no *seeming* contradiction based on an inference, can be entertained. Incomplete statements, or inferences, must always be interpreted in harmony with positive declarations. By so doing we shall find perfect harmony in the Bible. E. J. W.*SITI June 11, 1885, page 361.11*

June 18, 1885

“Inheritance of the Saints. Continued. An Earthly King Chosen” The Signs of the Times, 11, 24.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—JULY 18

No Authorcode

AN EARTHLY KING CHOSEN

1. Give two proofs that the partial possession of Canaan by the Israelites was not the fulfillment of the promise.*SITI June 18, 1885, page 374.1*

2. If the possession of the land had been complete, would that have been a complete fulfillment of the promise?*SITI June 18, 1885, page 374.2*

“And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised; that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed unto them also.” *Romans 4:11.SITI June 18, 1885, page 374.3*

3. When the Lord brought them from Egypt, what did he promise to make of them?*SITI June 18, 1885, page 374.4*

“Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people; for all the earth is mine; and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel.” *Exodus 19:5, 6.SITI June 18, 1885, page 374.5*

4. How were they governed for many years after that time?*SITI*

June 18, 1885, page 374.6

“After that he gave unto them judges about the space of four hundred and fifty years, until Samuel the prophet.” *Acts 13:20.SITI June 18, 1885, page 374.7*

5. Who was the last of the judges?*SITI June 18, 1885, page 374.8*

“And Samuel judged Israel all the days of his life. And he went from year to year in circuit to Bethel, and Gilgal, and Mizpeh, and judged Israel in all those places. And his return was to Ramah; for there was his house; and there he judged Israel; and there he built an altar unto the Lord.” *1 Samuel 7:15-17.SITI June 18, 1885, page 374.9*

6. In his days what did the Israelites demand?*SITI June 18, 1885, page 374.10*

“Then all the elders of Israel gathered themselves together, and came to Samuel unto Ramah, and said unto him, Behold, thou art old, and thy sons walk not in thy ways: now make us a king to judge us like all the nations.” *1 Samuel 8:4, 5.SITI June 18, 1885, page 374.11*

7.What did the Lord say they had done in making this demand?*SITI June 18, 1885, page 374.12*

“And the Lord said unto Samuel, Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee; for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them.” *1 Samuel 8:7.SITI June 18, 1885, page 374.13*

8. Then under whose immediate authority must they have been up to this time?*SITI June 18, 1885, page 374.14*

9. What did the Lord say that Samuel should do?*SITI June 18, 1885, page 374.15*

“And the Lord said unto Samuel, Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee: for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them.” “Now

therefore hearken unto their voice: howbeit yet protest solemnly unto them, and show them the manner of the king that shall reign over them.” “And the Lord said to Samuel, Hearken unto their voice, and make them a king. And Samuel said unto the men of Israel, Go ye every man unto his city.” *1 Samuel 8:7, 9, 22.SITI June 18, 1885, page 374.16*

10. Who was chosen as their first king?*SITI June 18, 1885, page 374.17*

“And afterward they desired a king; and God gave unto them Saul the son of Cis, a man of the tribe of Benjamin, by the space of forty years.” *Acts 13:21.SITI June 18, 1885, page 374.18*

“And when Samuel saw Saul, the Lord said unto him, Behold the man whom I spake to thee of! this same shall reign over my people.” *1 Samuel 9:17.SITI June 18, 1885, page 374.19*

11. By whom was Saul chosen as king over Israel?*SITI June 18, 1885, page 374.20*

“Now the Lord had told Samuel in his ear a day before Saul came, saying, To-morrow about this time I will send thee a man out of the land of Benjamin, and thou shalt anoint him to be captain over my people Israel, that he may save my people out of the hand of the Philistines; for I have looked upon my people, because their cry is come unto me.” *1 Samuel 9:15, 16.SITI June 18, 1885, page 374.21*

12. Had the Lord, then, but utterly rejected his people because of their rejection of him?*SITI June 18, 1885, page 374.22*

No; this is shown by the fact that he chose their king for them.*SITI June 18, 1885, page 374.23*

There is a seeming discrepancy between *Acts 13:20* and *1 Kings 6:1*. The latter text says that Solomon began to build the temple in the four hundred and eightieth year after the exode, which would not allow all four hundred fifty years of government by judges. The explanation which seems the simplest is that which connects *Acts 13:20* with the first part of the *17th verse* of the same chapter, and

regard the expression, "about the space of four hundred and fifty years," as explanatory of the words "and after that." Thus: The God of this people of Israel chose our fathers.... and about the space of four hundred and fifty years after that he gave unto them judges, until Samuel the prophet. E. J. W. *SITI June 18, 1885, page 374.24*

"Thoughts on the Third Psalm" The Signs of the Times, 11, 24.

E. J. Waggoner

This psalm is said to be "a psalm of David, when he fled from Absalom his son." There is no reason to suppose that this inscription is not correct. Whether it was written during the flight, or was written afterwards, as expressing the feelings which he had on that occasion, is immaterial. Knowing the circumstances which called for this psalm we can enter more fully into the feelings of the psalmist. Those circumstances we find recorded in detail in *2 Samuel 15, 16, 17*. With the incidents therein related fresh in our minds, let us examine the psalm, and see what there is in it which is profitable for us. See *2 Timothy 3:16, 17. SITI June 18, 1885, page 374.25*

Verse 1. "Lord, how are they increased that trouble me! many are they that rise up against me." The same language may be used by every one who professes to follow Christ. To every one the warning is given, "Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he made devour." *1 Peter 5:8*. He is at the head of a host, so that we have, as the apostle says, to contend "against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against wicked spirits in high places." *Ephesians 6:12*. Moreover, Christians are informed that in the world they shall have tribulation; Satan is the "god of this world," and since he is the enemy of all righteousness we would naturally expect that the world would not be friendly to the Christian. So we read, "If ye were of the world, the world would love its his own; but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world, hateth you." *John 15:19*. It is often said that the world is now becoming friendly to Christians and Christianity. To this we would simply repeat the text above quoted, and others of a similar nature. The world persecuted Christ,

and he says: "The servant is not a greater than his lord. If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you.... But all these things will they do unto you for my name's sake, because they know not him that sent me." *John 15:20, 21*. James wrote, as a truth for all times, that "the friendship of the world is enmity with God, whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God. *James 4:4*. When, therefore, we hear men speak of Christians whom the world loves, we must conclude that their Christianity is worldliness; that instead of being followers of God, they are enemies.*SITI June 18, 1885, page 374.26*

Besides the devil and the world, each one has his own self, the worst enemy of all, to contend against. "The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." "For the flesh lusteth again this Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other; so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." Surely we may well say, as did David, "Lord, how are they increased that trouble me! many are they that rise up against me."*SITI June 18, 1885, page 375.1*

Verse 2. "Many there be which say of my soul, There is no help for him in God." David's enemies thought that his overthrow was complete. One of them said, tauntingly, "The Lord hath returned upon thee all the blood of the house of Saul, in whose stead thou hast reigned; and the Lord hath delivered the kingdom into the hand of Absalom thy son; and, behold, thou art taken in mischief because thou art a bloody man." *2 Samuel 16:8*. Even so the world, looking at the faults of Christians, will say, "They are no better than others; they do things that are just as bad as the things that we do; there is no more hope for them than for us." And the Christian himself, who, more than anyone else, has a vivid sense of his own shortcomings, too often gives way to the same desponding thoughts. How often people say: "I have so many sins to overcome, and am so weak, that it doesn't seem of much use for me to try." What is this but saying of one's own soul, "There is no help for him in God"?*SITI June 18, 1885, page 375.2*

Notice the use of the word "soul," in this verse. Some imagine that the terms soul invariably refers to an "immaterial substance," to something which has unending existence, yet which is not an entity.

But David, speaking of those who were seeking his life, said, “Many there be which say of my soul, There is help for *him* in God.” *SITI June 18, 1885, page 375.3*

Verses 3, 4. “But thou, O Lord, art a shield for me; my glory, and the lifter up of a mine head. I cried unto the Lord with my voice, and he heard me out of his holy hill.” No portion of the Scriptures was written without a purpose. “Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have a hope.” *Romans 15:4.* When we read in the Old Testament, how wonderfully God delivered his people in time of battle, it is that we may take courage. Not that we are to engage in physical warfare, in which God will fight for us, but that we may know God’s power to help all who are in trouble. In the *20th chapter of 2 Chronicles* we find an interesting account of the deliverance of the Jews, from their enemies, who greatly outnumbered them. This was done because the people believed and trusted in the Lord. The case of Gideon and his army (*Judges 6 and 7*) is a similar one. These were visible proofs of God’s power to deliver, and serve to give us confidence in such promises as the following:-*SITI June 18, 1885, page 375.4*

“The Lord is good, a stronghold in the day of trouble; and he knoweth them that trust in him.” *Nahum 3:7.SITI June 18, 1885, page 375.5*

“But God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it.” *1 Corinthians 10:13.SITI June 18, 1885, page 375.6*

The fifth verses shows God’s continual care for his people: “I laid me down and slept; I awaked; for the Lord sustained me.” How many of us are there who remember as they arise in the morning that “it is of Lord’s mercies that we are not consumed, because his compassions fail not.” (*Lamentations 3:22*), and that “they are new every morning”? The adversary of souls would destroy us. As a roaring lion he walks about, seeking whom he may devour, and this he would do with us physically as well as spiritually; for if he could cut short our lives, while we are unprepared for the Judgment, he

would thereby most effectually devour us, and bring us to eternal ruin. That he does not do this, is because of the continual watchfulness of God. "Behold, he that keepeth Israel shall neither slumber nor sleep." *Psalm 121:4.SITI June 18, 1885, page 375.7*

It is remarkable that when driven from his throne by traitors, who cared for nothing but to take his life, David could peacefully lie down and sleep. The source of this peace is found in *Isaiah 26:3, 4*: "Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on thee; because he trusteth in thee. Trust ye in the Lord for ever; for in the Lord Jehovah is everlasting strength." Having one's mind stayed on God is equivalent to delighting in and obeying his law (*Psalm 1:1-3*), as we read, "O that thou hadst hearkened to my commandments! then had thy peace been as a river, and thy righteousness as the waves of sea." *Isaiah 48:18*. The Bible abounds in statements concerning the peace and blessedness of those who obey God.*SITI June 18, 1885, page 375.8*

But it will be objected that David had not kept the law, and that his present distress was the direct consequence of his sins. That is true, and this is why many said of his soul that there was no help for him in God. We are often tempted, as before stated, to say the same thing of ourselves, when for some cause we are brought to a vivid sense of our sinfulness. In such times we forget, what David remembered, that although no man could stand before God if he were unable to answer for his conduct, there is forgiveness effectual, that he may be feared. *Psalm 130:3, 4*. David had sinned, but he had repented, and believing God's promise (see *Isaiah 55:7*), he could rest as peacefully as though he had never committed a sin.*SITI June 18, 1885, page 375.9*

Why should we not thus rise above the temptations of the enemy? Paul says: "What shall we then say to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us? He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things? Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth." *Romans 8:31, 33.SITI June 18, 1885, page 375.10*

With these texts before us, but we need not wonder at David's

boldness, as indicated in *verse 6*: “I will not be afraid of ten thousands of people, that have set themselves against me roundabout.” There are two reasons why people may not fear an invading army: 1. Because they are in league with the enemy, or intend to yield without resistance. 2. Because they are strongly fortified and protected, and are confident that with the help which they have they can make a successful resistance. David’s boldness was of the second class. Many persons think it an indication of virtue to invite temptation, that they may show how they can resist it. In the case before us we see that boldness is not always inconsistent with flight. David was fleeing from his pursuers, yet he felt fearless in the Lord. So we, while we are to resist the devil, that he may flee from us, are not to seek opportunities to resist him. Our prayer is to be, “Lead us not into temptation;” we are to shun the place of evil, but when the enemy comes to us, we are to vigorously resist him. We may be sure that he will not allow us to lack of opportunities to put forth all the strength he can muster. *SITI June 18, 1885, page 375.11*

In the *7th verse* David states as already accomplished, what the Lord will do for all his people. He will save them, and discomfit their enemies. Comparing the enemies to ravenous beasts, who would be disabled by having their teeth broken, he says: “Thou hast smitten all mine enemies on the cheek; thou hast broken the teeth of the ungodly.” The psalm then appropriately closes with an acknowledgement of God as the author of both present and future, complete salvation. “Salvation belongeth unto [or, it is of] the Lord; thy blessing is upon thy people.” E. J. W. *SITI June 18, 1885, page 375.12*

June 25, 1885

“Inheritance of the Saints. Continued. Rejection of Saul as King of Israel”
The Signs of the Times, 11, 25.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—JULY 25

No Authorcode

REJECTION OF SAUL AS KING OF ISRAEL

1. Who was the first king of Israel?*SITI June 25, 1885, page 390.1*

“And afterward they desired a king; and God gave unto them Saul the son of Cis, a man of the tribe of Benjamin, by the space of forty years.” *Acts 13:21.SITI June 25, 1885, page 390.2*

2. By whom was he chosen? *Ib.SITI June 25, 1885, page 390.3*

3. How long did he reign? *Ib.SITI June 25, 1885, page 390.4*

4. On one occasion what message came from the Lord to Saul from Samuel?*SITI June 25, 1885, page 390.5*

“Samuel also said unto Saul, The Lord sent me to anoint thee to be king over his people, over Israel; now therefore hearken thou unto the voice of the words of the Lord. Thus saith the Lord of hosts, I remember that which Amalek did to Israel, how he laid wait for him in the way, when he came up from Egypt. Now go and smite Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have, and spare them not; but slay both man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass.” *1 Samuel 15:7-9.SITI June 25, 1885, page 390.6*

5. How did Saul carry out his instructions?*SITI June 25, 1885, page 390.7*

“And Saul smote the Amalekites from Havilah until thou comest to Shur, that is over against Egypt. And he took Agag the king of the Amalekites alive, and utterly destroyed all the people with the edge of the sword. But Saul and the people spared Agag, and the best of the sheep, and of the oxen, and of the fatlings, and the lambs, and all that was good, and would not utterly destroy them: but every thing that was vile and refuse, that they destroyed utterly.” *1 Samuel 15:7-9.SITI June 25, 1885, page 390.8*

6. What excuse did Saul make for thus disobeying the command the Lord?*SITI June 25, 1885, page 390.9*

“And Saul said unto Samuel, Yea, I have obeyed the voice of the Lord, and have gone the way which the Lord sent me, and have brought Agag the king of Amalek, and have utterly destroyed the Amalekites. But the people took of the spoil, sheep and oxen, the chief of the things which should have been utterly destroyed, to sacrifice unto the Lord thy God in Gilgal.” *1 Samuel 15:20, 21.SITI June 25, 1885, page 390.10*

7. What did Samuel say the Lord values more than sacrifices?*SITI June 25, 1885, page 390.11*

“And Samuel said, Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams.” *1 Samuel 15:22.SITI June 25, 1885, page 390.12*

8. To what was Saul’s stubbornness equivalent?*SITI June 25, 1885, page 390.13*

“For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry. Because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, he hath also rejected thee from being king.” *1 Samuel 15:23.SITI June 25, 1885, page 390.14*

9. What had he rejected?*SITI June 25, 1885, page 390.15*

He had rejected the word of the Lord.*SITI June 25, 1885, page 390.16*

10. Since rebellion is equal to idolatry, had not Saul, in rejecting the word of the Lord, rejected the Lord himself?*SITI June 25, 1885, page 390.17*

Certainly the record shows that Saul was virtually an idolater, and thus as wicked as the Amalekites, whom he had been sent to destroy.*SITI June 25, 1885, page 390.18*

11. Because Saul had thus rejected the Lord, what had the Lord done?*SITI June 25, 1885, page 390.19*

“For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry. Because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, he hath also rejected thee from being king.” “And Samuel said unto Saul, I will not return with thee: for thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, and the Lord hath rejected thee from being king over Israel.” *1 Samuel 15:23, 26.SITI June 25, 1885, page 390.20*

12. What had he rent from Saul?*SITI June 25, 1885, page 390.21*

“And Samuel said unto him, The Lord hath rent the kingdom of Israel from thee this day, and hath given it to a neighbour of thine, that is better than thou.” *1 Samuel 15:28.SITI June 25, 1885, page 390.22*

13. To whom did Samuel say the kingdom was given? *lb.SITI June 25, 1885, page 390.23*

14. What important lesson may we learn from the narrative in this chapter?*SITI June 25, 1885, page 390.24*

From the narrative recorded in *1 Samuel 15*, we may learn how particular God is in his requirements, and how dangerous it is for us to presume to deviate from the plain letter of his commandments. Saul flattered himself that God would overlook his disobedience in preserving the best of the flocks of the Amalekites because, they were preserved for sacrifice. But God would not accept such a service. Had he accepted Saul's excuse, it would have been the equivalent to admitting that Saul knew what would honor the Lord better than the Lord himself knew, and that was not true. When God tells us to do a thing in a certain way, we are to understand that to

do just as he says, will honor him more than anything else. We are not at liberty to presume that we can honor him by different course; that would be setting ourselves above God, and consequently we would be idolaters. From this narrative we can see an illustration of *Proverbs 28:9*: "He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination." E. J. W. *SITI June 25, 1885, page 390.25*

"Upper Columbia Camp-Meeting" The Signs of the Times, 11, 25.

E. J. Waggoner

This meeting was held on the old camp-ground at Milton, Or., and was preceded by a ten days' session of Bible study. The attendance at the meeting was much smaller than last year; the excessively cold weather and dry spring had put crops back so much that many felt unable to come. Much-needed rains fell a few weeks before the meeting, which caused some to take courage and reverse their decision to stay away. If our brethren allow the fear of hard times to hinder them from obtaining the spiritual blessings God places within their reach, they will lose much. If the Lord is indeed soon coming, we cannot look for long-continued seasons of temporal prosperity, yet our spiritual needs are greater than ever. We need the blessings to be received at our annual gatherings more than ever before, and sacrifices must be made to obtain them. *SITI June 25, 1885, page 393.1*

Sometimes the Lord tries us, and we find that the sacrifice does not prove so great as we thought it would be. One brother who hesitated long about attending, finally left his work and attended a portion of the Institute and the camp-meeting. On his return home, he found that his business had prospered in his absence more than when he was present. *SITI June 25, 1885, page 393.2*

Two class exercises of the Institute were held each day before the meeting, and one every day after the meeting began. The intervals between classes during the Institute were devoted to study and to work on the ground. Morning and evening prayer-meetings were held each day, and these, together with the influence of the Bible study, gave those present a good preparation for the meeting. As

people came onto the ground just before or at the beginning of the regular camp-meeting, they found the Spirit of the Lord already present, and a deep interest manifested. Indeed, it was not possible, as one brother said, to tell when the camp-meeting really began.*SITI June 25, 1885, page 393.3*

The business sessions were marked by a spirit of union, and a desire to see the cause advance. The ten days' session of Bible study allowed the workers present to mature plans and to arrange business so that it could be attended to with dispatch. The Lord helped in the preaching of the word, to a marked degree, and the social meetings were seasons of blessing. Many said that it was the best camp-meeting that they had ever attended; this was not because of the smoothness of the preaching, but because there was a willingness on their part to carry out the instructions given.*SITI June 25, 1885, page 393.4*

In closing, we wish to mention two benefits resulting from the holding of a Biblical Institute before and during a camp-meeting: 1. The people have something to think and talk about. We never attended a camp-meeting where there was so little visiting and idle talk. Wherever a little group was gathered, they were engaged in her study, preparing for the next recitation. 2. As a natural consequence, the spiritual interests of the meeting was quickened. The Holy Spirit came into hearts as they meditated on the word. If no permanent increase of knowledge had been gained by those present, these results alone would amply repay for the effort. We trust, however, that lasting impressions have been made, and that all have received a new impetus in Bible study.*SITI June 25, 1885, page 393.5*

We are now on the pleasant camp-ground in Portland, ready to begin the work to-morrow morning. E. J. W. *Portland, Or., June 13, 1885.**SITI June 25, 1885, page 393.6*

July 2, 1885

“Inheritance of the Saints. Continued. The Promise to David” The Signs of the Times, 11, 26.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—AUG 1

No Authorcode

THE PROMISE TO DAVID

1. Relate the circumstances which led to the rejection of Saul as king of Israel. See *1 Samuel 15.SITI July 2, 1885, page 406.1*

2. Where is this narrative recorded? *Ib.SITI July 2, 1885, page 406.2*

3. When Samuel said that the Lord had taken the kingdom from Saul, to whom did he say it had been given?*SITI July 2, 1885, page 406.3*

“And Samuel said unto him, The Lord hath rent the kingdom of Israel from thee this day, and hath given it to a neighbour of thine, that is better than thou.” *1 Samuel 15:28.SITI July 2, 1885, page 406.4*

4. Who was the one whom the Lord chosen the place of Saul?*SITI July 2, 1885, page 406.5*

“And Nathan said to David, Thou art the man. Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, I anointed thee king over Israel, and I delivered thee out of the hand of Saul.” *2 Samuel 12:7.SITI July 2, 1885, page 406.6*

5. From what occupation was David taken to be made king?*SITI July 2, 1885, page 406.7*

“Now therefore so shalt thou say unto my servant David, Thus saith the Lord of hosts, I took thee from the sheepcote, from following the sheep, to be ruler over my people, over Israel.” *2 Samuel 7:8.SITI July 2, 1885, page 406.8*

6. Where do we have an account of the choosing and the anointing of David?*SITI July 2, 1885, page 406.9*

“And the Lord said unto Samuel.... Fill thine horn with oil, and go, I will send thee to Jesse the Beth-lehemite; for I have provided me a king among his sons.... And Samuel did that which the Lord spake.... And he sanctified Jesse and his sons, and called them to the sacrifice. And it came to pass, when they were come, that he looked on Eliab, and said, Surely the Lord’s anointed is before him. But the Lord said unto Samuel, Look not on his countenance, or on the height of his stature; because I have refused him; for the Lord seeth not as man seeth; for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart. Then Jesse called Abinadab, and made him pass before Samuel. And he said, Neither hath the Lord chosen this. Then Jesse made Shammah to pass by. And he said, Neither hath the Lord chosen this. Again, Jesse made seven of his sons to pass before Samuel. And Samuel said unto Jesse, The Lord hath not chosen these. And Samuel said unto Jesse, Are here all thy children? And he said, There remaineth yet the youngest, and, behold, he keepeth the sheep. And Samuel said unto Jesse, Send and fetch him: for we will not sit down till he come hither. And he sent, and brought him in. Now he was ruddy, and withal of a beautiful countenance, and goodly to look to. And the Lord said, Arise, anoint him: for this is he. Then Samuel took the horn of oil, and anointed him in the midst of his brethren; and the spirit of the Lord came upon David from that day forward. So Samuel rose up, and went to Ramah.” *1 Samuel 16:1-13.SITI July 2, 1885, page 406.10*

7. When the Lord placed David over his people, what did he do for him?*SITI July 2, 1885, page 406.11*

“Now therefore so shalt thou say unto my servant David, Thus saith the Lord of hosts, I took thee from the sheepcote, from following the sheep, to be ruler over my people, over Israel; and I was with thee

whithersoever thou wentest, and have cut off all thine enemies out of thy sight, and have made thee a great name, like unto the name of the great men that are in the earth.” 2 Samuel 7:8, 9.*SITI July 2, 1885, page 406.12*

8. What did he make him?*SITI July 2, 1885, page 406.13*

“And I was with thee whithersoever thou wentest, and have cut off all thine enemies out of thy sight, and have made thee a great name, like unto the name of the great men that are in the earth.” 2 Samuel 7:9.*SITI July 2, 1885, page 406.14*

9. What did the Lord say he would yet do for David?*SITI July 2, 1885, page 406.15*

“Also the Lord telleth thee that he will make thee a house.” 2 Samuel 7:11, last clause.*SITI July 2, 1885, page 406.16*

10. To whom did the Lord say he would establish the kingdom?*SITI July 2, 1885, page 406.17*

“And when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom.” 2 Samuel 7:12.*SITI July 2, 1885, page 406.18*

11. For how long a time did the Lord say that David’s house and kingdom should be established?*SITI July 2, 1885, page 406.19*

“And thine house and thy kingdom shall be established forever before thee; thy throne shall be established forever.” 2 Samuel 7:17. E. J. W.*SITI July 2, 1885, page 406.20*

July 16, 1885

“Inheritance of the Saints. Continued. Promise Concerning the Kingdom of Israel” *The Signs of the Times*, 11, 27.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—AUG. 8

No Authorcode

PROMISE CONCERNING THE KINGDOM OF ISRAEL

1. Why was Saul rejected from being king of Israel?*SITI July 16, 1885, page 422.1*

“For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry. Because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, he hath also rejected thee from being king.” *1 Samuel 15:23.SITI July 16, 1885, page 422.2*

2. Who was chosen in his stead?*SITI July 16, 1885, page 422.3*

“Now therefore so shalt thou say unto my servant David, Thus saith the Lord of hosts, I took thee from the sheepcote, from following the sheep, to be ruler over my people, over Israel.” *2 Samuel 7:8.SITI July 16, 1885, page 422.4*

3. By whom was David chosen to be ruler?*SITI July 16, 1885, page 422.5*

4. Where do you find the record of his anointing? *1 Samuel 16:1-13.SITI July 16, 1885, page 422.6*

5. Repeat the promise which the Lord made to David concerning his house and kingdom.*SITI July 16, 1885, page 422.7*

“And thine house and thy kingdom shall be established forever

before thee; thy throne shall be established forever.” *2 Samuel 7:16.SITI July 16, 1885, page 422.8*

6. What promise did the Lord make yet the same time concerning his Israel?*SITI July 16, 1885, page 422.9*

“Moreover I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, that they may dwell in a place of their own, and move no more; neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more, as beforetime.” *2 Samuel 7:10.SITI July 16, 1885, page 422.10*

7. What did he say he would appoint for them? *Ib.SITI July 16, 1885, page 422.11*

8. Where should they dwell? *Ib.SITI July 16, 1885, page 422.12*

9. From what should they be free? *Ib.SITI July 16, 1885, page 422.13*

10. From *2 Samuel 7:10*, quoted above, what conclusion must be draw concerning the promises made to Abraham, and to the Israelites at Sinai?*SITI July 16, 1885, page 422.14*

We must conclude that those promises were not fulfilled in the possession of the land of Canaan by the Israelites. If they had been, we would not at this time find the Lord renewing the same promise, when they were already in the land that the Lord had given to them.*SITI July 16, 1885, page 422.15*

11. In what condition was the kingdom of Israel when the Lord made the promise recorded in *2 Samuel 7:10*?*SITI July 16, 1885, page 422.16*

“And it came to pass, when the king sat in his house, and the Lord had given him rest round about from all his enemies.” *2 Samuel 7:1.SITI July 16, 1885, page 422.17*

12. Then what must we conclude concerning that promise of rest and peace?*SITI July 16, 1885, page 422.18*

Since the Israelites were already dwelling in the land that the Lord

had given them by Joshua, and were at peace with all around them, it follows that the promise of a land of their own, and of rest and peace, must refer to something in the future, something far greater than anything yet known. This can only be found in that perfect inheritance when the “kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom.” *Daniel 7:27*. This will be the perfect rest that remains for the people of God, for when the meek inherit the earth they shall “delight themselves in the abundance of peace.” *Psalms 37:11*. *SITI July 16, 1885, page 422.19*

13. Who was David’s immediate successor? *1 Kings 1:32-39*. *SITI July 16, 1885, page 422.20*

14. What had the Lord said concerning him? *SITI July 16, 1885, page 422.21*

“And when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build an house for my name, and I will stablish the throne of his kingdom for ever.” *2 Samuel 7:12, 13*. E. J. W. *SITI July 16, 1885, page 422.22*

“Camp-Meeting in Portland, Oregon” *The Signs of the Times*, 11, 27.

E. J. Waggoner

The details of this meeting have been sufficiently reported by Elder Loughborough, but we would add a few thoughts. First, we were made to realize more than ever before the necessity of progress in meetings of that kind. If the work of the Biblical Institute was in its general features the same as the one in Milton, but it did not have the lifting influence on the meeting that it would have had if those attending had had time to devote to study. The truths of the word cannot be absorbed by the simple contact; if we would make them our own we must search for them as for hidden treasure. All the powers of the mind, aided by the Spirit of God, must be brought to bear, and by this means they will be strengthened. There is no discipline of mind equal to the study of the Bible. Although our

circumstances were somewhat unfavorable, the institute was by no means a failure. Those present received new ideas as to how to study the Bible; the familiar truths were seen in a new light, and above all, the great central, elevating a truth-God's love for mankind-was realized by many as never before. He returned to their homes rejoicing in a hope and confidence to which they had hitherto been strangers.*SITI July 16, 1885, page 425.1*

One interesting feature was the children's meetings. These were held every day, beginning when the Institute was about half over. The aim in these meetings was to tell the gospel story in language suited to the comprehension of the youngest, and to lead them to the study of the word for themselves. It is a mistake to suppose that to reach the minds of children one must talk in a childish manner, or in any degree to lower the dignity of the subject. Familiar illustrations, both to the eye and the ear, should be freely used, but no word should be uttered that would lead any to think that the way of salvation for a child is different from that for the adult. The "deep things of God," if properly presented, are more readily grasped by young minds, than by those of mature years. The plan of salvation is so simple in its greatness that the average man overlooks it. Like Naaman, we find the thing required of us very difficult because it is so simple. But in childhood everything is real; the simplicity of childhood was given by Christ as the pattern for Christians. There is, therefore, every encouragement in teaching the children the way of life. There were no meetings held on the ground that were more full of interest than those held with the children.*SITI July 16, 1885, page 425.2*

In these meetings, as well as in all others, much prominence was given to the subject of reverence for God's word, and for the places where he is worshiped. As the result of this teaching, we had as quiet and orderly a camp-ground as I ever saw. The children were made to feel that the entire camp was a sacred place, and there was scarcely any running and playing or loud talking even during intermissions. Care was taken to have all enter the tent where meetings were held, in a reverent matter, with head uncovered. Surely we should not come into God's house with less indication of respect than we would into a neighbor's parlor.*SITI July 16, 1885, page 425.3*

We believe that as outward marks of respect were shown, reverence was increased in the heart, and God added his blessing. If the parents will now carry out the lessons which they learned, and will also seek to deepen the impressions made upon the children, and endeavor to instruct and interest them in sacred things, they will find their own souls watered, and will see their children growing up to strengthen the church, and may God help them, and abundantly bless the North Pacific Conference. E. J. *WSITI July 16, 1885, page 425.4*

“The Sabbath in Eden” The Signs of the Times, 11, 27.

E. J. Waggoner

It has been our constant aim to avoid controversy as far as was possible. Believing that the coming of the Lord is here, and that the strict observance of the ten commandments (with divine assistance) is necessary to a complete preparations for that event, we design to get these truths before the people in the most direct manner possible. While, therefore, we deprecate debate, we dare not lower the standard of truth because it is opposed. Whenever we make strictures upon those who teach differently, we do so, not because they have assailed “our position,” but because they oppose what we firmly believe to be Bible truth. We do not consider ourselves as standing in opposition to anybody, but as simply lifting up the truth, which is being trodden down. *SITI July 16, 1885, page 425.5*

Quite frequently newspaper articles and reports of sermons in opposition to the Sabbath, are sent to us, with the request that we reply to them. Of course these articles contain no argument for objection that has not been met and answered hundreds of times, and our first impulse is usually to throw them aside as unworthy of further notice. But we recollect that the old objection which to us seems so flimsy, is to many a new one, and a real stumbling-block. Therefore we feel constrained to give them notice. If that notice be often extended, it is not because we fear that truth itself will suffer by the opposition, but that honest minds that have not been accustomed to think upon Bible themes, may not be entangled in error. It is for this reason that we begin to briefly notice a series of articles on the Sabbath question, by C. E. W. Dobbs, D. D., recently

published in the *Indiana Baptist*. *SITI July 16, 1885, page 425.6*

The writer takes the position throughout, that Sunday (invariably called by him the “Lord’s day”) is not the Sabbath, and that its observance, although the obligatory upon Christians, derives no force from the fourth commandment; that it is purely a “gospel institution, and that the fourth commandment, enjoining the observance of Saturday, has, with the rest of the Decalogue, entirely passed away.” *SITI July 16, 1885, page 425.7*

One word concerning the idea that the Sunday-sabbath is a gospel institution. If this were so, then it must stand upon the same plane as other gospel ordinances, baptism and the Lord’s Supper. No Christian, whatever denomination, thinks of allowing unbelievers to participate in these ordinances. If the Sunday-sabbath be a gospel institution, then no unbeliever must be allowed, much less compelled, to observe it. But Dr. Dobbs does not believe this theory any more than do his Baptist brethren. This is proved by their own actions. A Baptist father would not invite his unconverted children to partake of the Lord’s Supper, nor would he allow them, while still unconverted, to be baptized, yet he would require them, while they were subject to his authority, to observe Sunday. Notwithstanding what men may say, their actions show that they do not really believe that Sunday is a Christian ordinance. *SITI July 16, 1885, page 425.8*

We most heartily agree with the Doctor in his claims that Sunday observance finds no authority in the fourth commandment. But, knowing that there is no Bible authority outside of the fourth commandment for the observance of any day as sacred, we conclude that the Doctor’s admission rules Sunday out of the question. By the side of that admission, we wish to place a few others. In its issue of March 1, 1882, the *California Christian Advocate* said:- *SITI July 16, 1885, page 425.9*

“When we plead for a law for it [Sunday] as a day of rest, we can justify that only on the ground that it is according to the law of nature, and necessary to man.... We cannot sustain it before the people, if we claim its sanctity as a religious institution.” *SITI July 16, 1885, page 425.10*

Very true, only it would be difficult for the *Advocate* to show how to rest on Sunday meets the wants of man's nature, anymore than rest on Saturday. The *Christian at Work*, in its issue of April 19, 1883, said:-*SITI July 16, 1885, page 425.11*

"Some plant the observance of the Sabbath [Sunday] squarely on the fourth commandment, which was an exquisite injunction to observe Saturday, and no other day, as a holy day unto the Lord.... The truth is, so soon as we appeal to the *litera scripta* [*i.e.*, the plain reading] of the Bible, the Sabbatarians have the best of the argument."*SITI July 16, 1885, page 425.12*

Again, its issue of January 8, 1885, the *Christian at Work* says:-*SITI July 16, 1885, page 425.13*

"We rest of the designation of Sunday on the church having 'set it apart of its own authority.' The seventh-day rest was commanded in the fourth commandment, as it is written in every tissue and trembling fiber of the human frame. The selection of Sunday, thus changing the particular day designated in the fourth commandment, was brought about by the gradual concurrence of the early Christian church, and on this basis and *none other* does the Christian Sabbath, the first day of the week, rightly rest."*SITI July 16, 1885, page 425.14*

All true; but if the observance of Sunday was brought about by the "gradual concurrence" of the church, then of course it was not instituted by Christ; and if it was not instituted by Christ, then it is obviously not a Christian institution; and therefore, although "the church" did gradually effect this change, it was to that extent at least unchristian. But now for the argument against the Sabbath. We quote:-*SITI July 16, 1885, page 425.15*

"Some find evidence of the Edenic institution of the Sabbath in *Genesis 2:3*: 'God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work.' This is supposed to be the enactment of the Sabbath law for the race. But it is an exceedingly frail support for such an institution. The language is only the historian's statement that the Sabbath, instituted two thousand years afterwards, had a commemorative relation to creation. It is barely mentioned by him proleptically, as giving the

divine determination to sanctify the seventh day, and to constitute it a religious rest day in the future ceremonial law.” *SITI July 16, 1885, page 425.16*

How does the Doctor or anyone else find so much in *Genesis 2:3*? Those who say that *Genesis 2:3* records what the Lord designed to do two thousand years in the future, seem to be wise above that which is written, for there is not the slightest intimation of such a thing in the text. Just as reasonably might we affirm that “there was no marriage institution until two thousand years after the creation, the statement in *Genesis 2:24*, that a man ‘shall cleave unto his wife; and they shall be one flesh,’ being only the historian’s statement that the marriage relation, instituted two thousand years afterward, had a commemorative relation to the union of the first pair. It is merely mentioned by him proleptically, as giving the divine determination to sanctify the marriage relation, and to constitute it the sacred ordinance in the decalogue,” which, by the way, is in no sense a ceremonial law. But no sane man would accept such an interpretation, or rather *perversion*, of the Scriptures in regard to marriage; and no unprejudiced person can for a moment regard such reasoning as just when applied to the Sabbath. *SITI July 16, 1885, page 425.17*

What, then, may we will learn from *Genesis 2:3*? The text is plain: “And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made.” This immediately follows the statement that God “rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made.” Now we submit it to any candid person, that in *Genesis 2:1-3* events are mentioned in historical order. From the reading of the text, no one would imagine that the third verse refers to something two thousand years after the event mentioned in the second; and there is nowhere in the Bible any intimation that such is the case. It is a fact, then, that the blessing and sanctifying of the seventh day immediately followed God’s resting upon it, after the six days of creation were ended. To deny this is simply to make an *assertion* contrary to a plain declaration. Now we will find out what was comprehended in that act of sanctifying, and then we shall see upon what foundation the Edenic Sabbath rests. *SITI July 16, 1885, page 425.18*

To sanctify means “to set apart for a sacred or religious use; to make holy.”-*Webster*. Its use, as applied to inanimate objects, may be learned from the following instances: When the Lord was about to come down on Mount Sinai, he said to Moses, “And thou shalt set bounds unto the people round about, saying, Take heed to yourselves, that ye go not up into the mount, or touch the border of it: whosoever toucheth the mount shall be surely put to death.” *Exodus 19:12*. In *verse 23* we read, “And Moses said unto the Lord, The people cannot come up to mount Sinai; for thou chargedst us, saying, Set bounds about the mount, and sanctify it.” The mountain was sanctified, or set apart for a sacred use, and a barrier was built around it, so that none need be in doubt as to how far they might go. *SITI July 16, 1885, page 426.1*

Again, in *Joshua 20* we find that the Lord told Joshua to appoint six cities to which men who had accidentally slain a man might flee for refuge. “And they appointed [margin, *sanctified*] Kedesh in Galilee in mount Naphtali,” etc. *Joshua 20:7*. Here the same word is used as in *Genesis 2:3*. In what did the sanctification of these cities consist? In setting them apart for the use for which they were designed, by letting everybody know which cities were the cities of refuge. Without thus informing the people, the sanctification would have been a farce. Indeed, that is just what the sanctification was,-a public setting apart. *SITI July 16, 1885, page 426.2*

So with the Sabbath. First, God rested on the seventh day; then he blessed it, or spoke well of it; and lastly, he sanctified it, that is, he appointed that it should be preserved sacred. Just as Moses set bounds around the mount, so the Lord placed around the Sabbath the sanctions of his law. Now as we have seen that the sanctification immediately followed the resting and the blessing, we know to whom the Lord made the statement that the day was to be kept holy;-it was to all who were then living-Adam and Eve. But this pair represented all the inhabitants of the earth, for they had been commanded to “be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth.” We find, then, that *Genesis 2:3* teaches, in the most unmistakable language, that the seventh-day Sabbath was instituted at creation, and that it was designed for and given to all mankind. We may add, however, that in *Genesis 2:3* we do not find the enactment of the Sabbatic law before the race, but the statement, as a fact of history,

that such a law was made in creation. This point, borne in mind, removes the next objection, which shall be noticed next week. E. J. W.*SITI July 16, 1885, page 426.3*

July 23, 1885

“Human Ignorance vs. Divine Knowledge” *The Signs of the Times*, 11, 28.

E. J. Waggoner

Last week, in the article entitled “The Sabbath in Eden,” we showed that *Genesis 2:3* is an explicit declaration that the seventh day was sanctified immediately following God’s rest upon it at the close of creation, and that to sanctify means to set apart, to appoint; so that we have the inspired record that, in Eden, God decreed that men should observe the seventh day as the Sabbath. We cannot be so sure that George Washington commanded the American army during the war of the Revolution, as we are that in Eden God appointed the seventh day to be kept by all mankind. For the knowledge of that we are dependent on human evidence, while this fact is made known to us “by inspiration of God.” *SITI July 23, 1885, page 441.1*

But Dr. Dobbs says of *Genesis 2:3*:-*SITI July 23, 1885, page 441.2*

“To make the passage of any value as proof in this matter, it must be assumed that Genesis was an historic book, coming down from patriarchal times.” *SITI July 23, 1885, page 441.3*

It makes no difference when the book of Genesis was written, so far as this case is concerned. The Doctor might as well have said that we cannot know that God created the heavens and the earth in six days, because Moses was not there to see it done, and to make the record on the spot. The reader must remember that *Genesis 2:3* is not the commandment for Sabbath observance, but is simply the inspired record that such a command had been made. The patriarchs were not dependent on the record in Genesis, for their knowledge of the Sabbath, any more than the early colonists were dependent on “Ridpath’s History of the United States,” for their knowledge of the wars with the Indians or with Great Britain. We do need a history to inform us of that in which we are actors. *SITI July 23, 1885, page 441.4*

The lives of three men-Adam, Methuselah, and Shem-reach from

the creation to Isaac. Methuselah was two hundred and forty-three years old when Adam died, Shem was ninety-seven years old when Methuselah died, and Isaac was fifty years old when Shem died. There certainly was opportunity enough for the patriarchs to know of the appointment of the Sabbath in Eden, even though no records were kept. Dr. Cunningham Geikie, in his "Hours with the Bible," vol. 1, chap. 20, paragraph 9, speaking of the call of Abraham, says:-*SITI July 23, 1885, page 441.5*

"No details are given of the creed of Abraham, but, in addition to his confession of the one only living God, it must have included all that was true in the popular beliefs of Chaldea. This would imply his knowledge of the Sabbath; for the seventh day, by a tradition handed down from Eden, was 'holy,' in his Eastern native land, and was honored by the cessation of all work on it."*SITI July 23, 1885, page 441.6*

Dr. Geikie says that even the heathen had at that time preserved the tradition of the Sabbath from Eden; but whether they did or not, it is beyond controversy that the patriarchs knew all about the sanctification of the Sabbath in Eden. But even if it were possible that they did not, their ignorance would not in the least affect the fact, for we have the word of the Lord for it, that the seventh-day Sabbath was set apart in Eden. Our relation to the Sabbath of the Lord must be regulated by his commandment concerning it, and not by somebody else's knowledge or lack of knowledge, nor by the time its institution was recorded.*SITI July 23, 1885, page 441.7*

Again we quote from Dr. Dobbs:-*SITI July 23, 1885, page 441.8*

"Just here it may be well to state that the Jewish Talmud, so scholars tell us, knows nothing of any ante-Mosaic Sabbath. Their doctors universally date the Sabbath from the Mosaic institution, generally referring its commencement to *Exodus 15:25*: 'There he made a statute,' etc."*SITI July 23, 1885, page 441.9*

We have never read the Talmud, so we, with Dr. Dobbs, must depend for a knowledge of its content, on what "scholars tell us." Grant that the Talmud knows nothing of an Ante-Mosaic Sabbath, and what does it prove? Nothing. Whether the Talmud knows anything about the Sabbath either before or after Moses, or whether

it does not, matters not one whit. The Bible knows all about it, and it tells us in unmistakable language. We desire our knowledge of our duty to God, not from the Talmud, but from the Bible. If one honest man bears witness on a given point, the fact that a dozen other men know nothing about it does not overthrow his evidence. In other words, one man's knowledge of the fact, cannot be made of no effect by another one's ignorance. If all the man-made books in the world ignored the Sabbath, or knew nothing about its institution, it would make no difference; God's book remains unchanged.*SITI July 23, 1885, page 441.10*

But what of the statement that "their doctors universally date the Sabbath from the Mosaic legislation, generally referring its commencement to *Exodus 15:25*: 'There he made a statute,' etc." The preceding paragraph answers this statement also. If it were true that "their doctors" referred the institution of the Sabbath to the time when the Israelites were at Marah, that would not make it true, when the inspired record plainly tells us that it was instituted at creation. It is not an unheard-of thing for "doctors" to be mistaken. We have known doctors to say, in the face of the statement in *Genesis 2:3*, that God never blessed the seventh day; and we were presumptuous enough to believe the Bible in preference to the doctors. Whatever the Talmud may or may not say concern an ante-Mosaic Sabbath, Josephus says:-*SITI July 23, 1885, page 441.11*

"Accordingly Moses says that in just six days the world and all that is therein was made; and that the seventh day was a rest, and a release from the labor of such operations;-whence it is that we celebrate a rest from our labors on that day, and call it the Sabbath."-"*Antiquities*," Book 1, chap.1, section 1.*SITI July 23, 1885, page 441.12*

It is a matter for curiosity, however a man who can see no proof whatever for Sabbath observance, in *Genesis 2:3*, which speaks directly on a point, can find in *Exodus 15:25* evidence of its institution, when the latter text makes no hint of the Sabbath. But the human mind, when controlled by prejudice, is not subject to laws.*SITI July 23, 1885, page 441.13*

We have space in this article for just one more quotation:-*SITI July 23, 1885, page 441.14*

“It is worthy of remark also that no Christian ‘Fathers,’ among the writings which have come down to us from the first three centuries, ever based the observance of the Lord’s day [by this term the Doctor means Sunday] upon either the fourth commandment or a primeval and patriarchal Sabbath law.”*SITI July 23, 1885, page 441.15*

And it is worthy of remark that that indicates the good sense of the “Fathers,” more than anything which they did write. They did well not to base Sabbath observance upon the fourth commandment, nor upon any other commandment found in the Bible. It would be well if some of their successors in the Christian church would be as discreet. It is true that the “Fathers” did not base the observance of Sunday on the fourth commandment, but that need not hinder us from facing the observance of the seventh day, Saturday-the true Lord’s day-upon the commandment. The reader will notice that thus far all of Dr. Dobb’s argument against the Sabbath has been negative-consisting of what certain ones do not know about the Sabbath. In our next we shall examine what he claims to know about it. E. J. W.*SITI July 23, 1885, page 441.16*

July 30, 1885

“The Sabbath at the Exode” *The Signs of the Times*, 11, 30.

E. J. Waggoner

It will be remembered that in last week’s review of Dr. Dobbs, we noticed his position that the Sabbath was first instituted at the waters of Marah (*Exodus 15:25*). Whether he had some doubts of that, or whether it was simply because he is determined to prove that it is not commanded at creation, we do not know, but in his second article he takes the position that it was instituted in the Wilderness of Sin (*Exodus 16*). On this point he says:-*SITI July 30, 1885, page 457.1*

“The first mention of the Sabbath is in *Exodus 16:23*, ‘To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath’-where, by the way, the Hebrew has no definite article, reading ‘a rest of a holy Sabbath.’ The first intimation of this rest is verses four and five, where Jehovah tells Moses of the double rate of manna to be gathered on the sixth day. In *verse 22* we find the people doing this, and the rulers of the congregation, apparently not having heard, or at least not remembering the injunction given in verse five, came to tell Moses. He explains to them: ‘It is that rest which Jehovah hath spoken of, a rest-a holy Sabbath-is to-morrow.’ It is only in *verse 29* that we have the definite article ‘the Sabbath.’ ... Everything in the whole narrative seems to point to this as the first knowledge of the Sabbath. Careful study has convinced me that the weight of critical exegesis and scholarly interpretation places the beginning of the institution just here.”*SITI July 30, 1885, page 457.2*

The last statement, that “the weight of a critical exegesis and scholarly interpretation” places the institution of the Sabbath in the wilderness, gives us opportunity to quote from some critical scholars. The “Bible Commentary,” by a company of “Bishops of the Anglican Church,” has the following on *Genesis 2:3*:-*SITI July 30, 1885, page 457.3*

“The natural interpretation of these words is that the blessing of the Sabbath was immediately consequent on the first creation man, for

whom the Sabbath was first made (*Mark 2:27*).... Moreover, it appears that, before the giving of the commandments from Mount Sinai, the Israelites were acquainted with the law of the Sabbath. In *Exodus 16:5* a double portion of manna is promised on the sixth day, that none need be gathered on the Sabbath. This has all the appearance of belonging to an acknowledged, though perhaps neglected, ordinance of divine service; not as if then for the first time the Sabbath were ordained and consecrated.”*SITI July 30, 1885, page 457.4*

The same authority says that *Exodus 16:23* “is at once a statement and an injunction. The people knew it as the Sabbath, they were to observe it as a great festival.”*SITI July 30, 1885, page 457.5*

Dr. Scott, in his comment on *Genesis 2:3*, says:-*SITI July 30, 1885, page 457.6*

“The sacred writer here both records the appointment of the Sabbath, and assigns the reason for it: ‘Because that in it the Lord rested from all his work.’ This is evidently *historical*, and not by *anticipation*; for the reason subsisted from the beginning, and was more cogent immediately than it could be at a distance of more than two thousand years, when the command was solemnly renewed from Mount Sinai, long after sin had marred the beauty of the great Creator’s work; and it concerns the whole human race, as much as the nation of Israel.”*SITI July 30, 1885, page 457.7*

Other testimony to the same intent is given by Dr. Scott. Dr. Adam Clarke as an observer of the first day of the week, and a most critical scholar, yet he was not able to find, either in the Hebrew or in any translation of *Exodus 16*, any authority for supposing that the Sabbath was first given in the wilderness. On *Exodus 16:23*, he says:-*SITI July 30, 1885, page 457.8*

“There is nothing either in the text or context, that seems to intimate that the Sabbath was now *first* given to the Israelites, as some have supposed; on the contrary, it is here spoken of as being perfectly well known, from its having been generally observed. The commandment, it is true, may be considered as being now *renewed*; because they might have supposed that in their unsettled state in the wilderness, they might have been exempted from the

observance of it. Thus we find, (1) That when God finished his creation, he instituted the Sabbath; (2) When he brought the people of Egypt, he insisted on the strict observance of it; (3) When he gave the law, he made it a *tenth* part of the whole; such importance has this institution in the eyes of the Supreme Being.”*SITI July 30, 1885, page 457.9*

It may be well to state that “the weight of critical exegesis and scholarly criticism,” which places the institution of the Sabbath at the exode, is found among those German theologians who throw overboard a large portion of the Pentateuch as of a doubtful nature, and attribute a large portion of the remainder to a later age than that of Moses.*SITI July 30, 1885, page 457.10*

Concerning the statement that there is no definite article in the Hebrew of *Exodus 16:23*, but little need be said. In fact the Doctor makes no argument from it, but simply makes the statement. He has doubtless heard the statement made, or has read it somewhere, and thinks it must surely be an argument against the Sabbath, although he doesn’t know just how to make it, so he throws it in at random. As a matter of fact, although the definite article is not found in the Hebrew of *Exodus 16:23*, the word Sabbath is just as definite as it is in *verse 29*, where the definite article occurs. For instance, I may say “I went to church last Sabbath.” Now although I use no definite article, the word “Sabbath” is just as definite as it is possible to make it. Two paragraphs from a review of Armstrong’s Sunday book will be sufficient to put the matter clearly:-*SITI July 30, 1885, page 457.11*

“There are two methods of determining whether or not a Hebrew substantive is definite. 1. By the presence of the article. 2. By ‘construction.’ A noun may be determined to be definite as certainly and as easily in the absence of the article as in its presence, if the construction demands it. The article is then understood.”*SITI July 30, 1885, page 457.12*

“The word ‘Sabbath’ in *Exodus 16*, and in the decalogue, *Exodus 20*, is definite in every instance of its occurrence. It is made definite in *chap. 16:29* and *20:8, 11* by the use of the article; it is equally definite in *chap. 16:23, 25* and *20:10* by construction, in the

absence of the article.” *SITI July 30, 1885, page 457.13*

The reader will doubtless wonder what bearing the absence of the article from *verse 23* and its presence in *verse 29* has on the Sabbath question. It has just this bearing: Many people who know nothing of the Hebrew will read such a statement from a man who writes “D. D.” after his name, and although they cannot see any point to it, they think it certainly must mean something, and as that supposed something is in harmony with their prejudices, they rest content. The “reverend” men who make use of such “argument” know very well that a title, and a few phrases from, or allusions to, a foreign language, are wonderful conscience easers. E. J. W. *SITI July 30, 1885, page 457.14*

August 6, 1885

“No Probation after Death” *The Signs of the Times*, 11, 30.

E. J. Waggoner

A friend asks the SIGNS to give an exposition of *1 Peter 3:18, 19; 4:6*. He says that he has met a man who bases his believe in the immortality of the soul, on these two texts, the argument being that the dead spoken of are those that died previous to the promise to Abraham; that before Abraham's time there was no promise of the redeemer, and that to those who lived before that time, Christ went and announced the good news of salvation. The brother is not troubled on his own account, but wishes to know how to present the case to another. *SITI August 6, 1885, page 473.1*

In the first place, a man's opinion is no consequence whatever, unless he can offer some evidence in its support. When the objector says that there was no promise of the Messiah, until the time of Abraham, he must show proof, or else his theory is not worthy of consideration. That the Messiah was promised before our first parents were driven from the Garden of Eden, is susceptible of the clearest proof. Thus:-*SITI August 6, 1885, page 473.2*

1. It was the devil himself who attempted Eve. With *Genesis 3:13* and *2 Corinthians 11:3*, compare *Revelation 12:9*, which says that the serpent is the devil and Satan, and that it is he that deceiveth the whole world. There can be no controversy over the statement that it was the devil under the guise of a serpent, who caused our first parents to fall. *SITI August 6, 1885, page 473.3*

2. In the garden God said to the serpent, the devil, “I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.” *Genesis 3:15*. Here is the statement that the seed of the woman should destroy Satan; and when we read (*Hebrews 2:9, 14*) that Jesus died in order that “he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil,” we know that Jesus Christ is the “seed” mentioned in *Genesis 3:15*. So then, notwithstanding what may be said to the contrary, we know that the Messiah was promised

before the days of Abraham. More evidence could be given if it were needed.*SITI August 6, 1885, page 473.4*

But, it being true that the promised Messiah was known from the time of the fall, the supposition that Christ, between his crucifixion and his resurrection, went to preach the gospel to those who lived before the time of Abraham, or before the flood, amounts to nothing. There is absolutely no ground for the position that the people before Abraham were not on probation; therefore the only loophole for those who will have it that Christ, after his crucifixion, went and preached to some dead persons, is the more common position that certain ones, especially of the antediluvians, “did not have a fair chance,” and that justice required that after death they should have the chance of which they were deprived during their life-time. This is the position taken by Canon Farrar, and by all who, with him, adopt the theory of a probation after death. But this view is unscriptural and wicked, as we shall show.*SITI August 6, 1885, page 473.5*

It is wicked, because it presents God as a tyrant, changeable, and careless of the welfare of his subjects, instead of the God of infinite mercy, love and justice, and with whom is “no variableness, neither shadow of turning.” Take notice. If it were true that immediately after his crucifixion Christ went and preached to some who had lived before the flood, there could be no other reason for it, than the one usually given, namely, that they had not had “a fair chance,”-opportunity to hear and repent. Then we have presented to us the spectacle of God visiting his terrible wrath, as in the flood, upon men whom he had not given a chance to repent! No earthly tyrant was ever accused of greater cruelty and injustice than this. And then they would have us believe that the unchangeable God, as if to atone for his error, sent his Son to announce a pardon to those who had once been the subjects of his ill-advised wrath! We marvel how any who profess to love and reverence God, can countenance a theory that so degrades his character. It cannot be denied that the picture here presented is the legitimate and only result of the objector’s position on *1 Peter 3:18-20*. This alone is more than enough to stamp that position as erroneous.*SITI August 6, 1885, page 473.6*

That position is also wicked because it is unscriptural. The word of God says: "The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence." *Psalm 115:17*. Then even supposing that God had unjustly cut off some of the antediluvians, it would have been a hopeless mission for Christ to go to the grave to preach to them, for it would have been an impossibility for them to repent and give glory to God. More than this, allowing that Christ could and did go to the grave to preach to them, it would have been impossible for them to take any action whatever, for the inspired word says, "there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave." *Ecclesiastes 9:10*. It would have been impossible for them to hear the message, for, while the living may know many things, "the dead know not anything." *Ecclesiastes 9:5*. Of man it is said that "his breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." *Psalm 146:4*. And the grave is called, a "land of forgetfulness" (*Psalm 88:11, 12*), "a land of darkness, as darkness itself; and of the shadow of death, without any order, and where the light is as darkness." *Job 10:22*. *SITI August 6, 1885, page 473.7*

Moreover, that position would have it that Christ did not really die, and that is not only unscriptural, but subversive of the whole plan of salvation. "Christ died for the godly." *Romans 5:6*. He was "put to death" in order "He that might bring us to God." *1 Peter 3:15*. If, therefore, the divine Son of God did not die, then there is no salvation for sinners. But Christ did die; "poured out his soul unto death" (*Isaiah 53:12*), and his soul, thus poured out unto death, was as "an offering for sin" (*Isaiah 53:10*), and consequently there is hope for sinners. *SITI August 6, 1885, page 473.8*

Now let us read *1 Peter 3:18-20*, and see just what it does teach. The apostle after the exhortation to meekness under unjust accusation, says:-*SITI August 6, 1885, page 473.9*

"For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit; by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water." *SITI August 6, 1885, page 473.10*

Examine this text, and you will find the following simple statements:-*SITI August 6, 1885, page 473.11*

1. Christ, the just one, suffered for the sins of the unjust.*SITI August 6, 1885, page 473.12*

2. He did this that he might bring us to God.*SITI August 6, 1885, page 473.13*

3. He was put to death in the flesh.*SITI August 6, 1885, page 473.14*

4. He was made alive by the Spirit.*SITI August 6, 1885, page 473.15*

5. This Spirit was the same by which he went and preached to the spirits in prison.*SITI August 6, 1885, page 473.16*

6. This preaching was “when the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah.”*SITI August 6, 1885, page 473.17*

It is the Spirit that convinces of sin (*John 16:8*), and the Spirit was striving with men in the days of Noah. *Genesis 6:3*. So they did have a “chance,” but it was only while their days continued-in their case one hundred and twenty years. We see, then, that the preaching, spoken of in *1 Peter 3:18*, was done, not by Christ in person, but by the Holy Spirit; not in the Christian era, but before the flood; not to disembodied, conscious spirits confined in some part of *hades*, but to living men in the flesh, who were in the bondage of sin. See *Romans 7:14; Galatians 4:3*.*SITI August 6, 1885, page 473.18*

But what shall we do with *1 Peter 4:6*? Just believe it. Let us read it, together with the two preceding verses: “Wherein they think it strange that ye run not with them to the same excess of riot, speaking evil of you; who shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead. For this cause was the gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit.”*SITI August 6, 1885, page 473.19*

This has been done many times in our experience. We have often heard the gospel preached to men that are dead. But they were not dead at the time the gospel was preached to them, and the Bible nowhere says that the gospel was ever preached to men who *were* dead when the preaching was done. Peter, however, says that it was preached to them that *are* dead, and that statement effectually shuts off the infidel argument for a second probation, that some men have “never had a chance.” The reason why the gospel was preached to them, is that both living and dead must be judged, and God is just. “It is appointed unto men once to die, and after this the Judgment” (*Hebrews 9:27*), and not another probation. Before death comes, all have an opportunity to repent, so that if the Judgment finds them void of righteousness, they will be speechless. *SITI August 6, 1885, page 473.20*

This is the simple truth concerning the oft-perverted words of Peter. They are easily understood, and give no warrant whatever for the idea of a life in the grave. E. J. W. *SITI August 6, 1885, page 473.21*

August 13, 1885

“The Sabbath of the Decalogue” *The Signs of the Times*, 11, 31.

E. J. Waggoner

In the third article by Dr. Dobbs, on the Sabbath question, we find the following:-*SITI August 13, 1885, page 488.1*

“The Sabbath of the Sinaitic decalogue was essentially and designedly a ceremonial institution of the Mosaic law, and as such was given and confined to that people whom the Lord their God had brought out of the land of Egypt. It was a sign between God and Israel only.”*SITI August 13, 1885, page 488.2*

In the next paragraph, he says:-*SITI August 13, 1885, page 488.3*

“Some good brethren, while assenting in the main to my proposition, have thought the use of the word “ceremonial” unfortunate and misleading. I class the Sabbath institution with the other positive rites of Judaism. *To my mind*, the Sabbath is no more spiritual or moral than are the Passover and the new moon festival observances, commanded in the law of Moses. It, as well as they, was but a part of the ‘shadows’ which were to ‘pass away’ when the ‘body’ should come.”*SITI August 13, 1885, page 488.4*

In answer to the Doctor’s statement that to *his* mind there is nothing spiritual or moral about the Sabbath, we would quote the words of Paul, in *1 Corinthians 2:14*: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” This Scripture has direct application in this case, for the apostle plainly declares that the one who refuses submission to the law of God, is not spiritual, but carnal. *Romans 8:7*. The same apostle plainly declares that “the law is spiritual;” that “the law is holy, and the commandment is holy, and just, and good.” *Romans 7:12, 14*. If the law is spiritual, then the fourth precept of the law is spiritual.*SITI August 13, 1885, page 488.5*

It is impossible to separate the fourth commandment from the rest

of the decalogue. It is, as a whole, the moral law. The psalmist was speaking of the law as it was pronounced from Sinai, when he declared that it "is perfect" (*Psalm 19:7*), and he certainly referred to the words which were spoken amid the thunders of Sinai, when he said, "Thy word is true from the beginning; and every one of thy righteous judgments endureth forever." *Psalm 119:160*. *SITI August 13, 1885, page 488.6*

Is the decalogue ceremonial and shadowy? If the fourth commandment is, the whole must be. When God said, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," what did that typify? When God said, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain," what portion of the work of Christ was shadowed forth? Can any one tell? The truth is, there is not a single one of the ten commandments which has in it anything whatever of a ceremonial nature. Think a moment, reader. Did you ever hear anybody mention anything in the life, sufferings, or death of Christ, of which the Sabbath was typical? No one ever attempted to show in Christ's work the antitype of the Sabbath. The antitype of every portion of the ceremonial law may be traced in the work of Christ, but not so with the moral law. That is not a shadow, but the *substance* which, when trampled upon, made it necessary for Christ's work to be performed. The apostle says, "Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God." *1 Corinthians 7:19*. *SITI August 13, 1885, page 488.7*

Some men *claim* that the Sabbath was given as a type of the saint's eternal rest. We have never seen any proof of such a thing, and we do not accept the statement as true; but if it were true, it would show that the Sabbath is still binding upon mankind, for the saints have not yet received their eternal rest, and the shadow can never stop until it reaches the substance. *SITI August 13, 1885, page 489.1*

The declaration of our Saviour, in *Matthew 5:17, 18*, is of itself sufficient to show that the law of God is not typical or shadowy: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." Till all what be fulfilled? Till all the

prophets be fulfilled. Christ's coming to earth was, as he said, in fulfillment of prophecy, for unto him all the prophets gave witness. *Acts 10:43*. But Christ did not at his first coming fulfill all that the prophets had spoken, for David, prophesying of him, said: "My mercy will I keep for him for evermore, and my covenant shall stand fast with him. His seed also will I make [to endure] for ever, and his throne as the days of Heaven." *Psalms 89:28, 29*. Here is a prophecy that cannot be completely fulfilled as long as the days of Heaven exist-in other words, it reaches to eternity;-and therefore since not a jot nor a tittle can pass from the law until *all* be fulfilled, it is evident that the ten commandments will exist in full force, without the slightest change, as long as eternity endures. *SITI August 13, 1885, page 489.2*

Now what about the statement that the Sabbath was given because God brought the Jews out of Egypt? The falsity of that assertion has already been shown, by the fact that the Sabbath was given to man in Eden. If it was given in Eden, and was kept centuries before the Egyptian bondage, as we have already shown, then it was not given to commemorate the deliverance from that bondage. *SITI August 13, 1885, page 489.3*

There was something given which, while it served as a shadow of something good to be done for the race, commemorated the deliverance from bondage. This was the passover, described in *Exodus 12*. But the passover was eaten in the night, and therefore Moses said: "It is a night to be much observed unto the Lord for bringing them out from the land of Egypt; this is that night of the Lord to be observed of all the children of Israel in their generations." *Exodus 12:42*. *SITI August 13, 1885, page 489.4*

The objector, as he reads this, will think of *Deuteronomy 5:15*, which reads thus: "And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm; therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day." That passage can afford no help to the opposers of Sabbath observance. Mark it well. It does not say that the Lord gave them the Sabbath day because he brought them out of Egypt, but that for that reason he commanded them to *keep*. There is quite a difference. The

Sabbath was given to men at creation. When the children of Israel were in hard and cruel bondage in Egypt, they had grievous tasks placed upon them, and their taskmasters would not allow them any respite. They were not allowed to keep the Sabbath. Moses demanded of Pharaoh that he should let the people go, so that they might serve the Lord. Pharaoh refused, and the Lord compelled him to let them go. When God, with a wonderful exhibition of his power, have brought them out of bondage, that they might serve him, what could be expected but that he would command them to do so.*SITI August 13, 1885, page 489.5*

The fact that God at that time *commanded* them to keep the Sabbath is no evidence that a previous command had not been given to do the same thing. If it were, then it would appear that it was never wrong to steal, nor do any other thing forbidden in the ten commandments, until the deliverance from Egypt, for we read in *Leviticus 19:36, 37*, as follows:-*SITI August 13, 1885, page 489.6*

“Just balances, just weights, a just ephah, and a just hin, shall ye have; I am the Lord your God, which brought you out of the land of Egypt. Therefore shall ye observe all my statutes, and all my judgments, and do them.”*SITI August 13, 1885, page 489.7*

Even Dr. Dobbs would scarcely claim that there was anything shadowy or ceremonial in dealing justly, or that the obligation to do so has passed away. Then why should he make that assertion in the case of the Sabbath? The Sabbath was in no sense a memorial of the deliverance from Egypt; but the fact that God had miraculously delivered his people so that they might serve him, made it eminently proper that he should renew his command to them to keep an already existing institution. E. J. W.*SITI August 13, 1885, page 489.8*

“Who Was Melchizedek?” The Signs of the Times, 11, 31.

E. J. Waggoner

How many times this question has been asked, and how many quires of paper have been used up in vain attempts to answer it! The number almost equals the number of those who have ever

thought about the matter. Some, in answer to the question, will have that he was Shem, and others insist that he must have been our Lord in disguise. And, strange to say, when a person has one of these ideas in his mind, it is almost impossible for anyone to rid him of it. *SITI August 13, 1885, page 489.9*

Now to us the discussion over this question has always seemed something strange. We cannot yet conceive how it is possible for anybody with even a slight knowledge of the Scriptures, to be bothered over the matter, for the Bible tells us who Melchizedek was, in just as plain terms as could be desired. For the benefit of all who are troubled over the question, "Who was Melchizedek?" we will give a direct answer from the Bible. Turn, if you please, to *Genesis 14:18-20*. There you will read:-*SITI August 13, 1885, page 489.10*

"And Melchizedek *king of Salem* brought forth bread and wine: and *he was the priest of the Most High God*. And he blessed him [Abram], and said, Blessed be Abram of the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth; and blessed be the most high God, which hath delivered thine enemies into thy hand. And he gave him tithes of all." *SITI August 13, 1885, page 489.11*

Here we are told, not only who he was but an incident in his life. He was both king of Salem and priest of the Most High God, and in that capacity he blessed the patriarch Abraham as he was returning from the slaughter of the five kings. He also received from Abraham a tenth part of all the spoil. See also *Hebrews 7:1-4*. *SITI August 13, 1885, page 489.12*

If this does not satisfactorily answer the question, we do not know what would. Take other instances! Who was David? Answer, He was king over Israel, and a prophet of God. Who was Moses? He was a prophet, and the leader and commander of the children of Israel. In the wilderness of Sinai, he went up into the mount; and God spoke to him face to face. Who was Paul? He was an apostle, called of God to carry the gospel to the heathen. All must admit that these answers tell plainly who David and Moses and Paul were. And in like manner, to say that now Melchizedek was king of Salem, and priest of God, fully answers the question, "Who was

Melchizedek?" *SITI August 13, 1885, page 489.13*

Suppose that in answer to the question, "Who was Moses?" I should say, "He was John the Baptist;" or that if some one should ask, "Who was David?" the answer should be given, "He was Hezekiah;" or that if when speaking of my neighbor Mr. Jones, I should be asked who he is, and should answer, "He is Mr. Brown;" what would be thought? People would think that my mind was wandering. To us it seems just as absurd to say that Melchizedek was Shem, or that he was Christ, as it would be to say that David was Paul, or that Mr. Jones is Mr. Brown. *SITI August 13, 1885, page 489.14*

To be sure, we have a more full record of Moses and David and Paul, than we have of Melchizedek, but what of that? We have by no means a complete record even of their lives. It is not necessary that we should know all of a man's history, in order to know who he was. Of Enoch we only know that he walked with God and was translated; yet no Bible student ever raises the question, "Who was Enoch?" *SITI August 13, 1885, page 489.15*

"But," some one will say, "we the parents and descent of these men, and of Melchizedek's parentage we know nothing." How many are there who can tell who Elijah's parents were? or who were his descendants, and how old he was when he was translated? No one knows. We are told only his office and some of the incidents of his life, just as in the case of Melchizedek. The schoolboy, in his reading, chances to find references to a man by the name of Paulding. He will ask, "Who was Paulding?" His teacher, or the Biographical Dictionary, will answer, "He was one of the American soldiers who, in 1780, captured Major Andre." We know nothing of his parentage, and are told only one incident of his life, yet we do not straightway conclude that he must have been Anthony Wayne. *SITI August 13, 1885, page 489.16*

"Yes," says the objector, "but the Bible says that Melchizedek had no parents." If that were so, it ought to put a stop to the folly of calling him either Shem or Christ, for we know who Shem's father was, and we know the age of Shem when he died. Likewise, of Christ, we know that as to his earthly life he was born of the Virgin

Mary, and that before he came to earth he was known, as he still is, as the “only begotten of God.” But the Bible does not say that Melchizedek had no parents. King James’ version reads, “Without father, without mother,” but this, in the Revised Version is correctly rendered, “without genealogy,” thus agreeing with the margin of the old version, “without pedigree.” His ancestry is not given, and in this he differs from the Levitical priests, in that their descent must be traced to Aaron. This was that which made his priesthood a type of Christ’s. Christ has no predecessor nor successor in his priestly office, and therefore he is set forth as the antitype of Melchizedek, who stands as the sole representative of his order. *SITI August 13, 1885, page 489.17*

The type and the antitype, the shadow and the substance, cannot be identical. Christ is a priest “after the order of Melchizedek,” and therefore it is impossible that they two should be one. Every attempt to go beyond the record and show the origin, descent, etc., of Melchizedek, is in reality an attempt to show that his priesthood was not a type of the priesthood of Christ. Let us give ourselves wholly to “those things which are revealed,” and not waste time in vain attempts to be wise above that which is written. E. J. W. *SITI August 13, 1885, page 489.18*

August 20, 1885

“The Sabbath a Sign” *The Signs of the Times*, 11, 32.

E. J. Waggoner

Last week we quoted a paragraph which stated that the Sabbath was a ceremonial institution, given to commemorate the deliverance from Egypt, and that it was only a sign for the Jews, a distinguishing mark. The first statement we considered, showing its fallacy; this week we have briefly to consider the Sabbath as a sign. We shall quote the texts referred to by Dr. Dobbs. *SITI August 20, 1885, page 505.1*

Exodus 31:13: “Speak thou also unto the children of Israel, saying, Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep: for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you.” *SITI August 20, 1885, page 505.2*

Ezekiel 20:12: “Moreover also I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them.” *SITI August 20, 1885, page 505.3*

Ezekiel 20:20: “And hallow my Sabbaths; and they shall be a sign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God.” *SITI August 20, 1885, page 505.4*

These three verses tell us plainly what purpose the Sabbath served as a sign. Strange to say, it was not a sign between the Jews and the Gentiles, not a mark of national distinction, but that the people might know the God of Heaven. Each one of these verses tells the same thing. It was a sign by which they might know the Lord. But mark: It was the Sabbath when *hallowed* that enabled them to know the Lord. The Sabbath institution, a mere theory, could have no such effect; but when they *kept* the Sabbath, they could know the true God—the God that would sanctify them. Heathen gods could not sanctify; and since the people could not know the true God unless they kept the Sabbath, it follows that keeping the Sabbath was necessary to sanctification. And this is just as true now as it was then. *SITI August 20, 1885, page 505.5*

Right here we have one strong evidence that the Sabbath was designed for all men. Thus: It is very certain that God wants all men to acknowledge him and to give him, the reverence and homage which is his due. It is hardly necessary to quote Scripture proof of this, since none will deny it. We will refer to one or two. "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour and power; for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created." *Revelation 4:11*. Paul also said that God "commandeth all men everywhere to repent." *Acts 17:30*. This repentance is to be "toward God." *Acts 20:21*. Now if all men everywhere are called upon to show repentance toward God, it is evident that it is the duty of all men to know and serve him. Again, those who know not God are to be punished with everlasting destruction. *2 Thessalonians 1:8, 9*. It is evident, then, that is the duty of all men to know God. *SITI August 20, 1885, page 505.6*

But the text above quoted, says that it was only by keeping the Sabbath that the children of Israel could know who was God. If it was the keeping of the Sabbath that caused them to know the true God, it must be the keeping of the Sabbath that insures a knowledge of God to other people. Therefore since God wants to be known by all, he wants his Sabbath to be kept by all. *SITI August 20, 1885, page 505.7*

But how is it that the keeping of the Sabbath can perpetuate the knowledge of the true God? Read the words of the Lord concerning the Sabbath, in *Exodus 31:17*: "It is a sign between me and the children of Israel for ever; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed." Now we have it. The keeping of the Sabbath causes our thoughts to turn to the creation, and thus we remember the true God, for it is his creative power that distinguishes him from false gods. "For all the gods of the nations are idols; but the Lord made the heavens." *Psalms 96:5*. "Thus shall ye say unto them, The gods that have not made the heavens and the earth, even they shall perish from the earth, and from under these heavens. He hath made the earth by his power, he hath established the world by his wisdom, and hath stretched out the heavens by his discretion." *Jeremiah 10:11, 12*. Now the only thing whatever to keep this truth prominently before the minds of men is the Sabbath. That and that alone is the

memorial of the creation.*SITI August 20, 1885, page 505.8*

Some may say that the works of creation are ever before us, and that we can ever keep the Creator in mind. But God foresaw that without the Sabbath man would not remember him, and the result has demonstrated his wisdom, for the people who disregard the Sabbath, very soon forget God. Without the weekly rest, in which they can meditate upon God's great power, they will soon cease to think of him at all; but the proper keeping of the Sabbath insures continual remembrance of God; for the Sabbath, to be kept properly, must be remembered throughout the week.*SITI August 20, 1885, page 505.9*

"But," says one, "the Sabbath, after all, was a sign only to Israel." This brings us to a brief consideration of why the Israelites are especially mentioned, and why it was that only the Israelites were gathered about the base of Sinai, to hear the law. Two reasons may be given:-*SITI August 20, 1885, page 505.10*

1. Of all the people on earth, the Jews alone retained the knowledge of the true God. Abraham had been called to separate from his heathen relatives, in order that he and his descendants might not, by heathen associations, be turned from their allegiance to him. God called Abraham for the same reason that four hundred years before he had chosen Noah,-because He alone was righteous. The people of the country in which he and his descendants were sojourners, were those who had sold themselves to the devil, and the Egyptians, to whom the Israelites were in bondage, were gross idolaters. In all the earth there was but one people, and that was Israel, that could have been induced to hearken to the voice of God. The law was therefore intrusted to them, with repeated injunctions not to forget it, in order that the knowledge of God might not become wholly extinct. Their duty was to hold up its light so that the nations might see it, and thus some be led to glorify God.*SITI August 20, 1885, page 505.11*

2. Because Israel alone had preserved the knowledge of the true God, he made a special promise to them, on condition that they should continue in his law. This was the first covenant, and when that was broken he made another, not with the Gentiles, but with

the same people-the house of Israel and Judah. *Jeremiah 31:31-34*. The promises of God are to none but the Israelites (*Romans 9:4*), and therefore all who are saved must be of Israel. *Romans 11:26*. The heavenly city, into which the redeemed shall enter, has but twelve gates, and on these gates are the names of the twelve tribes of the children of Israel. *Revelation 21:12*. We can readily see the reasonableness of this, when we remember that "Israel" signifies, "one who prevails," for none but the overcomers, those who prevail, can expect a place in the kingdom of God. And in this we find the strongest proof that God designed the seventh-day Sabbath to be kept by his people in all ages, because it is to be a sign between him and his people Israel forever. *SITI August 20, 1885, page 505.12*

"Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." *Exodus 20:8-10*. E. J. W. *SITI August 20, 1885, page 505.13*

August 27, 1885

“Sabbath and Sunday” The Signs of the Times, 11, 33.

E. J. Waggoner

There are only a few more things in Dr. Dobbs’ Sunday article which we wish to notice at present, and these are all of a favorable nature, that is, favorable to the Lord’s Sabbath. In article five, we find the following statement, every clause of which he thinks is worthy of emphatic iteration:-*SITI August 27, 1885, page 521.1*

“The Holy Spirit never calls the first day of the week the Sabbath. Wherever that word is found in the New Testament, is the name of the Jewish institution, and refers to the seventh day-Saturday. We ought not to be wiser than the Scripture.”*SITI August 27, 1885, page 521.2*

Amen. With the exception of the term “Jewish institution,” as applied to the Sabbath, we could heartily say to the above, amen and amen. We need not stop to argue concerning the objectionable term, for all our readers know that the Sabbath is the Lord’s, that he claims it as his own (*Exodus 20:10; 31:13; Isaiah 58:13; Mark 2:28*); and that it was observed in Eden, centuries before there was a Jew, and while “the whole earth was of one language and of one speech.” With the exception of that single expression, the above quotation would seem to be the language of an earnest Sabbatarian. No one would suspect that is from one who hates the Sabbath of the Lord.*SITI August 27, 1885, page 521.3*

Our readers will of course understand that the Doctor’s emphatic statement concerning the seventh day as the Sabbath of the Bible, is not because of any love for the Sabbath, nor disregard for Sunday, but simply because he would have Sunday called the “Lord’s day,” and would not have men observe any day as a *Sabbath*. Now let us see how his theory and practice agree. He is a Baptist preacher, and therefore whatever we find in the Baptist “Confession of Faith” may be quoted as his own words, since they have his endorsement. Following is the first article of that document:-*SITI August 27, 1885, page 521.4*

*"The Scriptures.-We believe that the Holy Bible was written by men divinely inspired, and is a perfect treasure of heavenly construction; that it has God for its author, salvation for its end, and truth, without any mixture of error, for its matter; that it reveals the principles by which God will judge us; and therefore is, and shall remain to the end of the world, the true center of Christian union, and the supreme standard by which all human conduct, creeds, and opinions should be tried."*SITI August 27, 1885, page 521.5

The twelfth article reads as follows:-*SITI August 27, 1885, page 521.6*

*"The Law and the Gospel-We believe the Scriptures teach that the law of God is the eternal and unchangeable rule of his moral government; that it is holy, just, and good; and that the inability which the Scriptures ascribe to fallen man to fulfill all its precepts, arises entirely from love of sin; to deliver them from which, and to restore them through a Mediator to unfeigned obedience to the holy law, is the one great end of the gospel, and of the means by grace connected with the establishment of the visible church."*SITI August 27, 1885, page 521.7

Doctor Dobbs, having subscribed his name to these articles, says that according to the Scriptures, the seventh day,-Saturday,-and that alone is the Sabbath, yet refuses to obey the commandment which says, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy;" "in it thou shalt not do any work." Now if we accept him as our guide in matters of religion, how shall we know which of his utterances we are to be guided? Our Saviour said: "The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat; all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works; for they say, and do not." *Matthew 23:2, 3*. He could say this with safety, for whatever their practice, the scribes always taught that the strictest obedience was to be rendered to the law. But we cannot save this of our modern teachers, for they do not always "say;" they give an uncertain sound, sometimes teaching strict conformity to the Bible, and again teaching that it is not to be obeyed. In such a case, we prefer to listen to the Bible alone. "We ought not to be wiser than the Scriptures." *SITI August 27, 1885, page 521.8*

We cannot refrain from noting one other point, to show the inconsistency of calling the seventh day “the Jewish Sabbath.” As correctly stated above, the Holy Spirit never called Sunday the Sabbath. Wherever that word is found in the New Testament, it refers to the seventh day Saturday. Now it is not only admitted, but zealously claimed, that the New Testament was written for the purpose of teaching Christianity. Its language is the language for Christians to use, and those who accept it indeed, are Christians. (We also believe the same in regard to the Old Testament.) Then it necessarily follows that the Sabbath is just as much a Christian as it is a Jewish institution. As a matter of fact it is neither Jewish nor Christian; it belongs to no race nor age; it is the Sabbath of the Lord. But the law of God, which the Baptist “Confession of Faith” justly calls “the eternal and unchangeable rule” of God’s moral Government, says, “Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work” (*Exodus 20:8-10*), and the Holy Spirit teaches emphatically in the New Testament that there is no Sabbath day but the seventh day.*SITI August 27, 1885, page 521.9*

In the same paragraph we find the following, from the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, quoted with approval; “The Lord’s day [Sunday] then was *not a continuation* of the Jewish Sabbath, which was at first also observed, but a *substitute* for it.” This is a fact, Sunday, improperly called Lord’s day, was *substituted* for the Sabbath of the Lord, just as the bishop of Rome was substituted for the Lord, and sprinkling was substituted for immersion. We have the same authority for substituting sprinkling for baptism, or regarding the pope as the vicar of Christ, that we have for substituting Sunday for the Sabbath.*SITI August 27, 1885, page 521.10*

One more quotation, from Dr. Dobbs sixth article:-*SITI August 27, 1885, page 521.11*

“It cannot be repeated too often that there is no Scripture authority for the transfer of the Sabbatic obligations and from the seventh day to the first day. Of such ‘change of day,’ not only the New Testament, but also the Christian literature of the early centuries, is absolutely silent. It was several hundred years after Christ before

Christians began to identify the Lord's day [Sunday, not the Lord's day] with the Sabbath, and to adduce the authority of the fourth commandment in support of its sanctity. Surely it is suggestive that such is the case." *SITI August 27, 1885, page 521.12*

Very suggestive indeed. Let every Baptist read the above paragraph, and then ask himself if he can consistently continue to keep a day which has no warrant from Scripture. The Doctor says that the fact that several hundred years after Christ, Christians began to adduce the fourth commandment in support of Sunday sanctity, is suggestive. Suggestive of what? It shows that they knew that the fourth commandment is of eternal obligation, and that being determined not to give up their Sunday for the Lord's Sabbath, they found that the only way to satisfy people who wanted to be loyal to God, was to make them believe that the fourth commandment enjoined the observance of Sunday. This they largely succeeded in doing; but as the end approaches, the light cannot be hid; truth will be fully manifest to all the honest in heart; and soon every individual who holds the faith of Jesus will also keep the commandments of God. E. J. W. *SITI August 27, 1885, page 522.1*

"Handling the Word Deceitfully" The Signs of the Times, 11, 33.

E. J. Waggoner

A friend who is quite active as a canvasser for the SIGNS, tells us that in the place where he is now working there is among the people quite a deep interest on the Sabbath question. In consequence of this interest, the Presbyterian minister in that place, is troubled, feeling that some of his flock will keep "the Sabbath of the Lord" in stead of "the venerable day of the sun." To satisfy the people that their previous custom of keeping Sunday is correct, and to make them believe that the seventh day is no longer the Sabbath, he resorts to a trick that is worthy of a Jesuit. He tells them that, in the original, the word in the New Testament for Sabbath, is an entirely different word from that which in the Old Testament is translated Sabbath, and that they do not have the same meaning. *SITI August 27, 1885, page 522.2*

To some, the sophistry and the falsehood contained in such a

statement would be apparent at once, but many honest persons would be thrown into confusion by a statement concerning languages with which they have no acquaintance. We think that we can easily relieve the minds of such, so that if the objection of that clergyman is all that troubles them, they need have no hesitancy in obeying the commandment. *SITI August 27, 1885, page 522.3*

It is true that the word for Sabbath in the original of the New Testament is different from that translated Sabbath, from the original of the Old. How is this? Simply because the New Testament was written in Greek, and the Old Testament in Hebrew. As a matter of course, the word for Sabbath would not be identical in both languages. Yet the thing mentioned is the same. A parallel to that minister's statement would be to claim that because the word for "horse" is not the same in France that it is in Germany, therefore the animal has an entirely different nature in the two countries. It is on a par with the statement of the late Spiritualist "Professor" Denton, that the word "resurrection" is not found in the Greek Testament. Of course not, for resurrection is an English word; but there is in the Greek Testament a word corresponding to it and having the very same meaning. Even so we would not expect to find the Greek word for Sabbath in the Hebrew Old Testament, nor the Hebrew word for Sabbath in the Greek New Testament. Yet both words have the same meaning that the English word Sabbath has. *SITI August 27, 1885, page 522.4*

When Martin Luther was before the Diet at Worms, he first made his defense in his native Germany, and afterward at the request of the emperor, who did not like the German, he repeated it in Latin. Does anybody suppose that his second speech had a different meaning from the first, because in the two languages things were called by different names? Of course not. These illustrations are sufficient to enable all to see through the trick to which the aforesaid clergyman resorted. *SITI August 27, 1885, page 522.5*

The lexicons will show that the Hebrew, Greek and English words for Sabbath have all one meaning. But one who knows nothing of either Hebrew or Greek may prove the fact for himself. The sacred historian, after describing the crucifixion of Christ, says "And that day was the preparation, and the Sabbath drew on. And the women

also, which came with him from Galilee, followed after, and beheld the sepulcher, and how his body was laid. And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested *the Sabbath day according to the commandment.*” *Luke 23:54-56.SITI August 27, 1885, page 522.6*

The “commandment” is found in the Old Testament, in *Exodus 20:8-11*, and says the Sabbath on which the women rested was “according to the commandment,” we have a positive evidence that the Sabbath of the New Testament is identical with that of the Old. And the fact that the Sabbath mentioned by Luke, immediately preceded the first day of the week, shows that the Sabbath of the Old and the New Testament is the seventh day of the week.*SITI August 27, 1885, page 522.7*

The requirements of courtesy make it impossible to characterize the course of that minister as it deserves. To say the least, it is dishonorable, and should at once deprive him of the respect and confidence of the people who know of it. And what should they think of a cause that requires its advocates to stoop to such mean evasions of truth? They must certainly conclude that the cause itself is the opposite of truth. For a man to adopt such methods of argument, is to confess in advance that the cause which he defends is a weak one, but that he is determined to win by deceit where he cannot by fair means. The course which he adopted to uphold Sunday is eminently worthy of an institution which owes its existence to fraud. Thank God, the truth does not require its advocates to resort to the tricks of the pettifogger. E. J. W.*SITI August 27, 1885, page 522.8*

September 3, 1885

“Bondage and Freedom” *The Signs of the Times*, 11, 34.

E. J. Waggoner

From a brother in Washington Territory we have received a request to explain *Galatians 4:1-31*, as there are some in the neighborhood who are trying to use that passage against the truth. It is impossible to give in one brief article an exhaustive explanation of the passage, since that would involve quite a lengthy dissertation on the law and the covenants. But we shall try to give a clear outline, so that the Bible student may readily grasp the apostle's meaning. Before long we hope to give a more full exposition of this and kindred passages.*SITI September 3, 1885, page 537.1*

To anyone who has carefully read the verses indicated, it is evident that three things are put in contrast with three other things. Hagar, ancient Jerusalem, and the old covenant, of which the first two stand as figures, are placed in opposition, to Sarah, the New Jerusalem, and the new covenant. Ishmael and Isaac stand respectively as representatives of those under the old covenant and the new.*SITI September 3, 1885, page 537.2*

Since Hagar was a bondwoman, the apostle, in using her as a symbol of the old covenant, means to indicate that the children of the old covenant are in bondage. They who are of the new covenant, are free, as Isaac was the son of a free woman. They that are of the old covenant, are after the flesh; while they of the new covenant are, as was Isaac, children of promise.*SITI September 3, 1885, page 537.3*

Before applying these points, let us briefly notice the difference between the two covenants. The first was made with the children of Israel when they left Egypt.*Hebrews 8:9*. The terms of that covenant are found in *Exodus 19:3-6; 24:3-7*. They were simply these. God promised to make of the Jews a great nation, a kingdom of priests, and they, in turn, promised to keep his law. This was all. Now in this covenant there was no provision for the forgiveness of sin either past or future,-no hint of Christ, through whom alone

forgiveness or power to keep the law could come. Before they made this covenant, they had all broken the law, and since they were unable of themselves to keep the law, for without Christ nothing can be done (*John 15:6*), it is evident that that covenant or pledge to keep the law simply brought them into bondage. When we say that it brought them into bondage, we do not mean that it brought them under obligation to keep the law, for that obligation existed before any covenant was made, and whenever they violated the law they were really in bondage; but that promise brought the matter right home to them, and served to cause them to realize that they were justly condemned. *SITI September 3, 1885, page 537.4*

Had there never been any other covenant than this, the whole world must have been lost, since without divine aid no one can keep the law, for the carnal mind is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. *Romans 8:7*. Some will ask if God did not know that they could not fulfill the promise so readily made, and if it was not trifling with them to make such a covenant with them. God did indeed know that they had no power to do as they agreed, but he was not trifling with them. With this promise in mind, and a desire to keep it, they could not fail to learn their true condition-lost-and that would turn their attention to that other covenant, already in existence, which the Lord makes with his people. This is the second covenant:-*SITI September 3, 1885, page 538.1*

“After these days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord; for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more.” *Jeremiah 31:33, 34. SITI September 3, 1885, page 538.2*

The only difference between this and the first is that provision is made for sins to be pardoned, and the law is to be written in their hearts; that is, this covenant makes it possible to arrive at perfection, for that is what is meant by having the law in the heart. Forgiveness of sins is an instantaneous work, but the writing of the law in the heart is a progressive work, the work of a lifetime. When

the law is fully written in the heart, then the individual is indeed sanctified; he is like Christ (*Psalm 40:8*), and is ready for translation. *SITI September 3, 1885, page 538.3*

We said that this second covenant was even then in existence. So it was, in effect. It is the same covenant which was made with Abraham since that covenant was confirmed in Christ (*Galatians 3:17*), and Abraham had the righteousness of faith. The same covenant had been made long before, as soon as the fall, as is indicated by the sacrifices by which the people showed their faith in a Saviour whose blood would secure their pardon. Had it not existed in substance from the beginning, there could have been no salvation for any; but men did receive pardon from the beginning, and the work of restoring the law in the hearts of believers has ever since been going on. This covenant, by procuring pardon for past sins and enabling the individual to keep the law, tends to liberty. It sets men free. The other covenant could not free a soul from the bondage in which he already languished. Those who cling to that are of the flesh (*Galatians 5:19, 21*), since they cannot keep the law. And it may properly be said that all who are out of Christ are under the old covenant; they are in bondage. *SITI September 3, 1885, page 538.4*

Now note in the passage under consideration, that the Galatians, who seemed willing to forego the blessings of the new covenant, are said to wish to be “under the law.” Then we may know that being children of the first covenant, being under the law, being after the flesh, and being in bondage, are all the same thing. But to be after the flesh is to be a violator the law of God (see *Galatians 5:19-21*), and therefore to be “under the law” is equivalent to being a violator of the law, and such are, of course, in bondage. See *Romans 7:14; 2 Peter 2:19*. Those who are children of the new covenant, have the law written in their hearts; they keep it, and therefore they walk at liberty. *Psalm 119:45. SITI September 3, 1885, page 538.5*

Now we learn from the first portion of the 4th of Galatians, that this was exactly the condition of the Galatians. Says Paul: “Howbeit then, when ye knew not God, ye did service unto them which by nature are no gods. But now, after that ye have known God, or

rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage?" *Verses 8, 9.* They were leaving Christ and going back into slavery, and this, Paul assured them, would make them children of the bondwoman. *SITI September 3, 1885, page 538.6*

This probably explains all that causes any controversy. Remember why it is that those who are children of Sinai are in bondage. It is not because we have nothing to do with that law which was spoken from Sinai; just the contrary. That law stands fast as the throne of God, and abates not one jot of the righteous demands. And because it is so firm, those poor sinners who know nothing of Christ's salvation, or, knowing it, will not accept it, are in hopeless bondage-hopeless until they turn to Christ. If the law were abrogated, there could be no bondage for any. E. J. W. *SITI September 3, 1885, page 538.7*

September 10, 1885

“Nebuchadnezzar’s Dream” The Signs of the Times, 11, 35.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—OCT. 8

Last week our lesson left us with Daniel about to relate and interpret the dream which had made so wonderful an impression on the mind of Nebuchadnezzar, who could not recall any portion of it. This week we have the dream itself, and a portion of the interpretation. Without the least hesitation, Daniel repeated the dream, which we quote entire. *SITI September 10, 1885, page 550.1*

“Thou, O king, sawest, and behold a great image. This great image, whose brightness was excellent, stood before thee; and the form thereof was terrible. This image’s head was of fine gold, his breast and his arms of silver, his belly and his thighs of brass, His legs of iron, his feet part of iron and part of clay. Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay, and brake them to pieces. Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshingfloors; and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them: and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth.” *Daniel 2:31-35. SITI September 10, 1885, page 550.2*

In this dream, by these symbols, the Lord had shown Nebuchadnezzar what should be “in the latter days.” *Verse 28.* Beginning with his own time, the history covered by this dream reaches to the end of time. This is shown by the fact that the four divisions of the image, marked by the four different metals, represented four empires, the last of which was to be dashed in pieces by the setting up of the everlasting kingdom of God, represented by the stone which smote the image. *Verses 44, 45.* Immediately after relating the dream, the prophet addressed the

king as follows: "Thou, O king, art a king of kings: for the God of heaven hath given thee a kingdom, power, and strength, and glory. And wheresoever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field and the fowls of the heaven hath he given into thine hand, and hath made thee ruler over them all. *Thou art this head of gold.*" *Verses 37, 38.SITI September 10, 1885, page 550.3*

These verses are as plain a statement of fact as any in the Bible. Two things are told. First, that Nebuchadnezzar's kingdom was represented by the head of gold, and second, that his empire was universal. The second item was of course well known to Nebuchadnezzar; the first must have riveted his attention. We say that the head of gold represented Nebuchadnezzar's kingdom, because the prophet immediately adds, "And after *thee* shall arise another *kingdom*;" and the Babylonian empire did not give place to another until twenty-three years after the death of Nebuchadnezzar.*SITI September 10, 1885, page 550.4*

The extent of the empire is indicated in *verse 38*: "And wheresoever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field and the fowls of the heaven hath he given into thine hand, and hath made thee ruler over them all. Thou art this head of gold." This means universal dominion. A few years later, the prophet Jeremiah bore testimony to the same effect. The kings of Tyre, Edom, Moab, etc., with Zedekiah, king of Israel, were contemplating a revolt from Babylonian rule. To show them the folly of such an attempt, the prophet, by the command of the Lord, sent messengers to them, saying, "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel; Thus shall ye say unto your masters; I have made the earth, the man and the beast that are upon the ground, by my great power and by my outstretched arm, and have given it unto whom it seemed meet unto me. And now have I given all these lands into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, my servant; and the beasts of the field have I given him also to serve him. And all nations shall serve him, and his son, and his son's son, until the very time of his land come; and then many nations and great kings shall serve themselves of him." *Jeremiah 4:4-7.SITI September 10, 1885, page 550.5*

This language is not figurative nor hyperbolical. It is plain history,

and is substantiated by the writings of profane historians. The "Encyclopedia Britannica," art. "Babylonia," after telling how Nabopolassar, ruler of the province of Babylonia, revolted from Assyrian rule, says:-*SITI September 10, 1885, page 550.6*

"The seat of empire was not transferred to the southern kingdom. Nabopolassar was followed in 604 by his son Nebuchadnezzar, whose long reign of forty-three years made Babylon *the mistress of the world*. The whole east was overrun by the armies of Chaldea, Egypt was invaded, and the city of the Euphrates left without a rival." *SITI September 10, 1885, page 550.7*

The city of Babylon is described at great length by Rollin ("Ancient History," Vol. 1, book 3, chap. 1), and by Prideaux ("Connexion," Vol. 1, book 2). Our space, however will allow us to give only the brief yet very clear description given by Herodotus, as quoted by Lenormant ("Ancient History of the East," Vol. 1, book 4, chap. 5, section 3). It is as follows:-*SITI September 10, 1885, page 550.8*

"The city stands on a broad plain, and is an exact square, a hundred and twenty furlongs in length each way, so that the entire circuit is four hundred and eighty furlongs. While such is its size, in magnificence there is no other city that approaches to it. It is surrounded, in the first place, by a broad and deep moat, full of water, behind which rises a wall of fifty royal cubits in width, and two hundred in height." *SITI September 10, 1885, page 550.9*

"And here I may not omit to tell the use to which the mould dug out of the great moat was turned, nor the manner wherein the wall was wrought. As fast as they dug the moat, the soil which they got from the cutting was made into bricks, and when a sufficient number were completed, they baked the bricks in kilns. Thus they set to building, and began to brick the borders of the moat; after which they proceeded to construct a wall itself, using throughout for their cement hot bitumen, and interposing a layer of wattled reeds at every thirtieth course of the bricks. On the top, along the edges of the wall, they constructed buildings of a single chamber, facing one another, leaving between them room for a four-horse chariot to turn. In the circuit of the walls are a hundred gates, all of brass, with brazen lintels and side posts. The bitumen used in the work was

brought to Babylon from the Is, a small stream which flows into the Euphrates at the point where the city of the same name stands, eight days' journey from Babylon. Lumps of bitumen are found in great abundance in this river.*SITI September 10, 1885, page 550.10*

"The city is divided into two portions by the river, which runs through the midst of it. The river is the Euphrates, a broad, deep swift stream, which rises in Armenia and empties itself into the Erythrean [Arabian] Sea. [The river does not flow directly into the Arabian Sea, but into the Persian gulf.] The city wall is brought down on both sides to the edge of the stream; thence from the corners of the wall there is carried along each bank of the river, a fence of burnt bricks. The houses are mostly three and four stories high; the streets all run in straight lines, not only those parallel to the river, but also the cross streets which lead down to the water side. At the river end of these cross streets are low gates in defense that skirts the stream, which are, like the great gates in the outer wall, of brass, and open on the water.*SITI September 10, 1885, page 550.11*

"The outer wall is the main defense of the city. There is, however, a second, inner wall, of less thickness than the first, but very little inferior to it in strength. The center of each division of the town was occupied by a fortress. In the one stood the palace of the kings, surrounded by a wall of great strength and size; in the other was the sacred precinct of Jupiter Belus, a square inclosure, two furlongs each way, with gates of solid brass, which was also remaining in my time."*SITI September 10, 1885, page 550.12*

The royal cubit was twenty-one inches. The reader will therefore see that the outer wall of the city was eighty-seven feet thick, and three hundred and fifty feet high. The city being divided into two parts by the Euphrates, the banks of which were protected by walls, the following means of passage was devised:-*SITI September 10, 1885, page 550.13*

"In each of these walls were twenty-five gates, corresponding to the number of the streets which gave upon the river; and outside each gate was a sloped landing-place, by which you could descend to the water's edge, if you had occasion to cross the river. Boats kept

ready at these landing-places to convey passengers from side to side; while for those who disliked this method of conveyance, a bridge was provided of a somewhat peculiar construction. A number of stone piers were erected in the bed of the stream, firmly clamped together with fastenings of iron and lead; wooden draw-bridges connected pier with pier during the day, and on these, passengers passed over; but at night they were withdrawn, in order that the bridge might not be used in the dark. Diodorus declares that besides this bridge, to which he assigns a length of five stades (about 1,000 yards), and a breadth of thirty feet, the two sides of the river were joined together by a tunnel, which was fifteen feet wide and twelve high to the spring of its arched roof.”-*Seven Great Monarchies (Rawlinson), Fourth Mon., chap. 4, par.6.SITI September 10, 1885, page 550.14*

The public buildings of the city were on the same magnificent scale. Of one of them we read:-*SITI September 10, 1885, page 550.15*

“The most remarkable edifice in Babylon was the temple of Bel, now marked by the *Babil* on the northeast, as Professor Rawlinson has shown. It was a pyramid of eight square stages, the basement stage being over 200 yards each way. A winding ascent led to the summit, and the shrine, in which stood a golden image of Bel, forty feet high, two other statues of gold, a golden table forty feet long and fifteen feet broad, and many other colossal objects of the same precious material.”-*Encyclopedia Britannica, art. Babylon.SITI September 10, 1885, page 550.16*

“The great palace was a building of still larger dimensions than the great temple. According to Diodorus, it was situated within a triple incloser, the outermost wall being twenty stades, the second forty stades, and the outermost sixty stades (nearly seven miles), in circumference. The outer wall was built entirely of plain baked brick. The middle and inner walls were of the same material, fronted with enameled bricks representing hunting scenes. The figures, according to this author, were larger than the life, and consisted chiefly of a great variety of animal forms.”-*Rawlinson’s Fourth Mon., chap.4, par.9.SITI September 10, 1885, page 550.17*

“But the main glory of the palace was its pleasure ground-the

'hanging gardens,' which the Greeks regarded as one of the seven wonders of the world. This extraordinary construction, which owed its erection to the whim of a woman, was a square, each side of which measured 400 Greek feet. It was supported upon several tiers of open arches, built one over the other, like the walls of a classic theater, and sustaining at each stage, or story, a solid platform, from which the piers of the next tier of arches rose. The building towered into the air to the height of at least seventy-five feet, and was covered at the top with a great mass of earth, in which there grew not merely flowers and shrubs, but trees also of the largest size. Water was supplied from the Euphrates through pipes, and was raised (it is said) by a screw working on the principle of Archimedes."-*Id., par. 10.SITI September 10, 1885, page 550.18*

The city, thus briefly outlined, well deserved the title given to it by the prophet,-"The glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency." It was brought to this state of grandeur by Nebuchadnezzar, whose life almost measured the length of the empire, and did fully cover the period of its glory. The empire dates, however, from about the accession of his father as governor of Babylon, in 625 B.C. (Encyc. Breit.), and with whom Nebuchadnezzar was associated in the year 606, the date of the beginning of the seventy years' captivity of the Jews. Three years later, in 603, the prophecy under consideration begins.*SITI September 10, 1885, page 551.1*

To the mind of man it would seem that the city so substantially built must stand forever, but God had spoken to the contrary. Said he: It "shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah. It shall never be inhabited, neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation.... But wild beasts of the desert shall lie there," etc. See *Isaiah 13:19-22*. Also *Isaiah 14:23*: "I will also make it a possession for the bittern, and pools of water; and I will sweep it with the besom of destruction, saith the Lord of hosts."*SITI September 10, 1885, page 551.2*

Now learn how completely the "besom of destruction" did its work, and know that no word of the Lord shall ever fail:-*SITI September 10, 1885, page 551.3*

“The traveler who passes through the land is at first inclined to say that there are no ruins, no remains, of the mighty city which once lorded it over the earth. By and by, however, he begins to see that though ruins, in the common acceptation of the term, scarcely exist, though there are no arches, no pillars, but one or two appearances of masonry even, yet the whole country is covered with traces of exactly that kind which it was prophesied Babylon should have. Vast ‘heaps or mounds, shapeless and unsightly, are scattered at intervals over the entire region where it is certain that Babylon anciently stood, and between the ‘heaps’ the soil is in many places composed of fragments of pottery and bricks, and deeply impregnated with nitre, infallible indications of it having once been covered with buildings.”-Rawlinson, *Fourth Mon.*, chap. 4. par. 15. E. J. W. *SITI September 10, 1885, page 551.4*

“Whom Shall We Obey?” The Signs of the Times, 11, 35.

E. J. Waggoner

We have received the following from a subscriber in Ohio:-*SITI September 10, 1885, page 552.1*

“I have been a reader of your paper since last spring, and am much interested in the reading of it. I am of your belief in regard to the Sabbath, but am at a loss to know what to do. The commandment says Sabbath, and our civil law is very strict on Sunday observance. Paul says, ‘Servants, obey your masters,’ ‘Obey the magistrates,’ and many other passages teach us the same thing. If we disobey the law, we disobey the Testament; if we do that, we disobey God. Give me light.”*SITI September 10, 1885, page 552.2*

This we can easily do. Once Peter and John were brought before the magistrates, and were commanded with threatenings as not to speak any more in the name of Jesus. Without the least hesitation they replied: “Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard.” *Acts 4:19, 20*. This refusal to obey the command of the magistrates was no idle boast, for when the two apostles were liberated, they went to preaching the same as before. Then the whole company of apostles were

arrested and thrown into jail. When they were brought before the rulers, and reminded of the prohibition that had been laid on them, Peter, and all the other apostles answered boldly, "We ought to obey God rather than men." *Acts 5:29.SITI September 10, 1885, page 552.3*

It is the duty of every man to live a quiet, peaceful life. We are to submit to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake (*1 Peter 2:13*), and to be subject for conscience sake (*Romans 13:5*). But it would be impossible for a man to break the law of God for the Lord's sake, or to disobey God for conscience sake. Therefore the sacred writers evidently mean that we are to obey men when civil laws do not interfere with the law of God. We are to be subject to the "higher powers," but there is no earthly power equal to God. He is the Most High. We say emphatically, that when human laws directly conflict with the law of God, those human laws must be broken. And the man who thus breaks human law, in order that he may keep God's law, will have a conscience void of offense both toward God and toward man.*SITI September 10, 1885, page 552.4*

This is one of the first principles of human law. Blackstone in his commentary says that if a law of man is in direct opposition to the law of God, we are in duty bound to break that law. Earthly rulers derive their power from God, therefore they have no power to contravene his will.*SITI September 10, 1885, page 552.5*

The three Hebrew children in the court of King Nebuchadnezzar, refused to obey the monarch's of unqualified demand for every one to bow before the image which he had set up. *Daniel 3*. The fact that their refusal would subject them to serious "inconvenience," did not affect them in the least. They boldly told the king that they would not disobey God in order to please him, took the consequences, and by their sturdy faithfulness gained a place in the inspired role of honor (*Hebrews 11*) as those who through faith "quenched the violence of fire." They did not know, however, that they would be thus delivered, but that made no difference.*SITI September 10, 1885, page 552.6*

Daniel, also, the only man of whom it is recorded that the Lord sent him a message telling him that he was "greatly beloved," had a

similar experience. He was a faithful servant of the king, leaving no duty unperformed, and yet when a decree was issued interfering with his duty to God, he paid no attention to it. In his forced disregard of the edict, he honored the king with all the respect possible, but much as he honored the king, he honored God more. Who does not know that these faithful men, who dared to obey God in spite of the laws and threats of kings, were more faithful in the surface of the rulers than were any of the troop of time-serving politicians who professed great respect for the laws of men, while they despised the authority of God?*SITI September 10, 1885, page 552.7*

It is more difficult for people to reason correctly in regard to the Sabbath than about almost anything else. Christians who applaud Daniel and his companions for their course, are afraid to keep the Sabbath of the Lord, lest they should offend man. Suppose the Government should pass a law making it obligatory on men to blaspheme the name of God; would the brother feel that he is in duty bound to swear? Suppose a law should be passed commanding him to steal, would the brother's conscience compel him to steal? If adultery were made legal, and severe penalties were pronounced against those who should refuse to engage in it, would he feel it to be his plain duty to violate the seventh commandment? Of course he would not. Well, the third, seventh, and eighth commandments are on the same foundation as the fourth. God says: "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in yet thou shalt not do any work." No man, nor set of men, nor entire nation, has any right to pass a law conflicting with that. They have no right to say that any individual shall not keep that day, or to attempt to compel him to refrain from working on any other day; for the commandment which sets apart the seventh day for rest, also sets apart the other six days for work. If the civil law says, You must keep Sunday instead of the Sabbath, it is not only my privilege, but it is my duty to break that law. Under whatever circumstances we are placed, we must remember that "we ought to obey God rather than men." That sentence settles the whole matter.*SITI September 10, 1885, page 553.1*

So far as this special case is concerned, we would say that we have many hundred brethren in Ohio, and none of them have as yet

found any serious difficulty in keeping the Sabbath. Should they be brought to the issue where they must decide between God's law and a conflicting civil law, we trust that they would have no hesitancy in deciding what to do. E. J. W.*SITI September 10, 1885, page 553.2*

September 17, 1885

“The Four Kingdoms” *The Signs of the Times*, 11, 36.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—OCT. 10

No Authorcode

THE FOUR KINGDOMS

Last week's lesson gave us a view of Babylon in the height of its power and glory, an empire spreading over the inhabited portion of the earth, having a capital that was “the glory of kingdoms,” the wonder of the world. We have also a prophetic view of its after condition, and learn from history how completely those prophecies have been fulfilled. We have now to learn how its royal power was broken. *SITI September 17, 1885, page 566.1*

“And after thee shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee.” *Daniel 2:39*. That is all the space devoted to the overthrow of that mighty empire. With all of its greatness, it would pass away in a night, like the last snow of winter with the spring shower. A striking lesson of the fleeting nature of all earthly possessions, is taught in that brief statement concerning the proud kingdom of Babylon. Elsewhere in the Bible we find the history which enables us to trace the succession of kingdoms; we shall first note that, and afterwards know the exact harmony with it, of the records of profane history. *SITI September 17, 1885, page 566.2*

In the fifth chapter of Daniel we learned that “Belshazzar the king made a great feast to a thousand of his lords, and drank wine before the thousand.” *Verse 1*. From the second verse (margin), we learn that this Belshazzar was the grandson of Nebuchadnezzar. It was formerly supposed that he was a sole king, and that he was also called Nabonadius; but later researches have shown that

Nabonadius was the king. He married the daughter of Nebuchadnezzar, and Belshazzar was his son, and was associated with him in the empire. On this occasion Belshazzar had charge of the city, because his father, having gone out to fight the Persians, had been defeated, and had retreated to Borsippa, a few miles below. Although an army was encamped under the walls of the city, Belshazzar gave himself up to the enjoyment of an idolatrous and licentious drunken debauch. The vessels of the house of God were brought out, in contempt of Him to whom they had been dedicated, and were used in the service of the abominable deities whom they adored as supreme. But in the midst of the wild revel a hand appeared on the wall, tracing unknown characters and letters of fire. Terror struck the hearts of all, and especially Belshazzar. Great rewards were promised to the one who should read the writing, and after some delay Daniel was brought in. Read the fifth chapter entire. *SITI September 17, 1885, page 566.3*

“And this is the writing that was written, MENE, MENE, TEKEL UPHARSIN. This is the interpretation of the thing: MENE; God hath numbered thy kingdom, and finished it. TEKEL; Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting. PERES; Thy kingdom is divided, and given to the Medes and Persians.” *Daniel 5:25-28*. Short, but terribly plain. Notwithstanding Daniel had said, “Thy kingdom *is divided*, and given to the Medes and Persians,” Belshazzar gave the promised gifts to Daniel, and went through the form of making him the third ruler in the kingdom, that is, next after himself, Nabonadius being first. The sentence thus announced by the prophet, was executed without delay. The record says, “In that night was Belshazzar, the king of the Chaldeans slain, and Darius the Median took the kingdom.” *Verses 30, 31*. From the sacred record, then, we learn that the breast and arms of silver (*Daniel 2:32*), represented the empire of Media. *SITI September 17, 1885, page 566.4*

The date in the margin of *Daniel 5* (B.C. 538) is that which is uniformly assigned to the fall of Babylon. We have space for only a brief sketch of its capture, but before giving that, we shall note two or three prophetic utterances concerning it, that the student may see how accurately prophecy is fulfilled. “Thus saith the Lord to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden, to subdue

nations before him; and I will loose the loins of kings [compare *Daniel 5:6*], to open before him the two leaved gates; and the gates shall not be shut; I will go before thee, and make the crooked places straight; I will break in pieces the gates of brass, and cut in sunder the bars of iron.” *Isaiah 45:1, 2*. “And I will make drunk her princes, and her wise men, her captains, and her rulers, and her mighty men; and they shall sleep a perpetual sleep, and not wake, saith the King, whose name is the Lord of hosts.” *Jeremiah 51:57*. *SITI September 17, 1885, page 566.5*

Now we will quote a few paragraphs from Rawlinson (Fourth Mon., chaps. 8, par. 51-53), says he gives the description in the most condensed form. As you read, compare with the above texts, and with *Daniel 5*. Bear in mind, also, the description of Babylon, as given last week: - *SITI September 17, 1885, page 566.6*

“Withdrawing the greater part of his army from the vicinity of the city, and leaving behind him only certain *corps* of observation, Cyrus marched away up the course of the Euphrates for a certain distance, and there proceeded to make a vigorous use of the spade. His soldiers.... dug a channel or channels from the Euphrates, by means of which a great portion of its water would be drawn off, and hoped in this way to render the natural course of the river fordable. When all was prepared, Cyrus determined to wait for the arrival of a certain festival, during which the whole population were wont to engage in drinking and reveling, and then silently in the dead of night to turn the water of the river, and make his attack. All fell out as he hoped and wished. The festival was held with even greater pomp and splendor than usual; for Belshazzar with the natural insolence of youth, to mark his contempt of the besieging army, abandoned himself wholly to the delights of the season, and himself entertained a thousand lords in his palace. Elsewhere the rest of the population was occupied in feasting and dancing. Drunken riot and mad excitement held possession of the town; the siege was forgotten; ordinary precautions were neglected. Following the example of their king, the Babylonians gave themselves up for the night to orgies in which religious frenzy and drunken access formed a strange and revolting medley. *SITI September 17, 1885, page 566.7*

“Meanwhile, outside the city, in silence and darkness, the Persians watched at the two points where the Euphrates entered and left the walls. Anxiously they noted the gradual sinking of the water in the river bed; still more anxiously they watched to see if those within the walls would observe the suspicious circumstance, and sound an alarm to the town. Should such an alarm be given, all their labors would be lost. If, when they entered the river-bed, they found the river-walls manned and the river-gates fast-locked, they would indeed be ‘caught in a trap.’ Enfiladed on both sides by an enemy whom they could neither see nor reach, they would be overwhelmed and destroyed by his missiles before they could succeed in making their escape. But, as they watched, no sounds of alarm reached them-only a confused noise of revel and riot, which showed that the unhappy townsmen were quite unconscious of the approach of danger.”*SITI September 17, 1885, page 566.8*

“At last shadowy forms began to emerge from the obscurity of the river-bed, and on the landing places opposite the river-gates scattered clusters of men grew into solid columns,-the undefended gateways were seized-a war-shout was raised-the alarm was taken and spread-and swift runners started off to ‘show the king of Babylon that his city was taken at one end.’ In the darkness and confusion of the night, a terrible massacre ensued. The drunken revelers could make no resistance. The king, paralyzed with fear at the awful writing on the wall, which too late had warned him of his peril, could do nothing even to check the progress of the assailants, who carried all before them everywhere. Bursting into the palace, a band of persons made their way to the presence of the monarch, and slew him on the scene of his impious revelry. Other bands carried fire and sword through the town. When morning came Cyrus found himself undisputed master of the city, which, if it had not despised his efforts, might with the greatest ease have baffled them.”*SITI September 17, 1885, page 566.9*

The historian says that if the city had not despised the efforts of Cyrus, it might with the greatest ease have baffled them. Very true; but it had been prophesied that they should be drunken, and the word of God, which foretold the destruction of Babylon, cannot fail. For further description of this affair, see Rawlinson, at length; and “Rawlinson Ancient History,” Book 4, chap.1, article 2, sections 1-

4. *SITI September 17, 1885, page 566.10*

“And Darius the Median took the kingdom.” Says Rawlinson: “The genius of Cyrus was essentially that of a conjurer, not of an administrator.... In Babylon he gave the entire direction of affairs in the hands of a Mede, to whom he allowed the title and style of king.”-*Fifth Mon., chap. 7, par. 35*. Rollin says (Book 4, chap. 1, art. 3, sec. 1): “When Cyrus judged he had sufficiently regulated his affairs in Babylon, he thought properly to take a journey into Persia. In this way thither, he went through Media, to visit his uncle Cyaxares, to whom he carried very magnificent presents, telling him at the same time that he would find a noble palace at Babylon, all ready prepared for him; and that he was to look upon that city as his own. Indeed, Cyrus, as long as his own uncle lived, held the empire only in co-partnership with him, though he had conquered and acquired it by his own valor. Nay, so far did he carry complaisance, that he let his uncle enjoy the first rank. It is Cyaxares who is called in Scripture Darius the Mede, and we shall find that under his reign, which lasted but two years, Daniel had several revelations.” At the death of Darius, Cyrus very naturally assumed sole control of the empire. See *Daniel 6:28.SITI September 17, 1885, page 566.11*

“And another third kingdom of brass, which shall bear rule over all the earth.” *Daniel 2:39*. We have found two universal empires, Babylon and Medo-Persia, corresponding respectively to the head of gold, and the breast and arms of silver, of the image. We have seen (*Daniel 2:38*) that Babylon was a universal empire. *Ezra 1:2* shows the same of the Persian monarchy: “Thus saith Cyrus king of Persia, The Lord God of heaven hath given me all the kingdoms of the earth; and he hath charged me to build him an house at Jerusalem, which is in Judah.” In harmony with this, Rawlinson says (*Fifth Mon., chap. 7, par. 26*): “Babylon became ‘an astonishment and a hissing’-all her prestige vanished-and Persia stepped manifestly into the place, which Assyria had occupied for so many centuries, of absolute and unrivaled mistress of Western Asia.” In those days, whoever ruled Asia, ruled the world.*SITI September 17, 1885, page 566.12*

Now we have the third kingdom in succession. That it is also a universal monarchy, is stated in the verse just quoted. A very brief

reference to another prophesy to identify this third kingdom, must suffice for this lesson. In the 8th of Daniel, *verses 3-8*, we find part of a vision which Daniel saw. He saw a ram standing by a river; the ram was so very powerful and fierce that no beast could stand before him, "but he did according to his own will." While the prophet was still looking, he saw a goat come from the west, running with incredible swiftness. This goat came to the ram, with fury, and smote him, and cast him down to the ground, and stamped upon him; and there was no power that could save the ram from the wrath of the goat. *Verses 20 and 21* explain this: "The ram which thou sawest having two horns are the kings of Media Persia. And the rough is the king of Grecia." Then since the goat overpowered the ram, the prophecy teaches that Grecia succeeded Medo-Persia as mistress of the world. *SITI September 17, 1885, page 566.13*

"And the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron: forasmuch as iron breaketh in pieces and subdueth all things; and as iron that breaketh all these, shall it break in pieces and bruise." *Daniel 2:42*. In passing, we must ascertain the name of this fourth universal empire, for universal it must be, since it is more powerful than all the preceding. This is the last of a series of four kingdoms reaching from the time of the prophet to the close of earthly things. Three-Babylon, Medo-Persia, and Grecia-have already been identified. Now, although this one is nowhere named in prophecy, if we anywhere find mention of a universal empire, other than the three just named, we shall know that it is the fourth, the one represented by the legs of iron. *SITI September 17, 1885, page 567.1*

Such a kingdom we find mentioned in *Luke 2:1*: "And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus, that all the world should be taxed." None but a universal monarch could issue such a decree, and his name is sufficient to identify him as a Roman. So, then, Rome was the fourth kingdom. *SITI September 17, 1885, page 567.2*

"And whereas thou sawest the feet and toes, part of potters' clay, and part of iron, the kingdom shall be divided; but there shall be in it of the strength of the iron, forasmuch as thou sawest the iron mixed with miry clay. And as the toes of the feet were part of iron, and part of clay, so the kingdom shall be partly strong, and partly broken.

And whereas thou sawest iron mixed with miry clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men; but they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay.” *Daniel 2:41-43.SITI September 17, 1885, page 567.3*

This partially explains itself; the full interpretation must be left for another lesson. We simply note the closing act. “And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever.” *Verse 44*. Here we have the fifth universal empire-the kingdom of the God of Heaven-represented by the stone, which dashed the image in pieces. That this kingdom is yet future, is clearly evident from the fact that the earthly governments are yet on this earth; when that is set up, no room will be found for them. Its subjects, moreover, will never die, for it is not to be “left to other people.” Its king will be the one of whom David prophesied that his throne should endure “as the days of Heaven” (*Psalms 89:29*); and its subjects will be all who, at the coming of the Lord, are found “meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light.” E. J. W.*SITI September 17, 1885, page 567.4*

“Another ‘Check’ Wanted” The Signs of the Times, 11, 36.

E. J. Waggoner

A little more than two years ago, one of our brethren went into Humboldt County, to hold meetings and do general missionary work. The weather was unfavorable with four meetings, but by faithful labor several persons were brought to see the light of truth, and began to keep the Sabbath. As some of these have been members of the M. E. Church, the minister in charge, one Mr. Woodward, preached a sermon, in which he attempted to overthrow the work already done, and attacked every doctrine which he thought was believed by Seventh-day Adventists. This sermon, when duly endorsed by the President of the University of the Pacific as “cogent and timely,” was labeled a “Check on Adventism,” and sent out to the world, that it might stop the progress of Seventh-day Adventism, just as it had in Humboldt County.*SITI September 17,*

1885, page 568.1

Well, two years have passed, and we are now inclined to agree with the learned Doctor who pronounced the book “cogent and timely.” At the time the “check” was given, there were six or eight Seventh-day Adventists in that county. Now there are more than one hundred who are firm in the truth, and zealous in its propagation; there are two good houses of worship completed and in use; one more is in process of construction; and the ground has been purchased for a fourth, which will be erected within two months. There is no other county in the State, where the cause is in so flourishing a condition. We have often wondered, of late, if it would not pay to get Mr. Woodward to visit some other county, and give Adventism another “check.” *SITI September 17, 1885, page 568.2*

We do not wish to give him so much praise as to turn his head. Perhaps the same results would have been seen if he had not put on his little brake. The truth has power in itself, and must produce convictions in the hearts of the honest. “What is the chaff to the wheat? saith the Lord. Is not my word like as a fire? saith the Lord; and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces?” *Jeremiah 23:28, 29*. Yet we believe it is the providence of God that unreasonable men should open up the store-house of error, in attempts to overwhelm the truth of God, so that all may see the difference between the chaff and the wheat. So we do not get excited when some one threatens to “expose the whole thing,” knowing that God can cause even the wrath of man to praise him, and that none can do anything against the truth, but for the truth. E.J. W. *SITI September 17, 1885, page 568.3*

“Death and the Coming of the Lord” The Signs of the Times, 11, 36.

E. J. Waggoner

In a sermon recently preached in New York by Dr. R. S. Storrs, from *Revelation 22:20*: “He which testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus.” Then he proceeded to answer the question as follows:-*SITI September 17, 1885, page 568.4*

"It was only natural and proper, we may think, that he should utter this prayer to Christ. But we may not so freely repeat it after him. There is a certain tremor of hesitation, natural to the heart, in echoing the words. We would rather, for ourselves, know beforehand, if it might be, the moment when the summons is to come; we would rather see the Master after all, and in a gradual approach; we would rather make special and protracted preparation for the voice which is to call us from all the circles of life on earth, to go and be henceforth with him. At any rate, we do not feel at liberty to offer a prayer for sudden death, and in this we are right. We have no right to offer such a prayer. Even John did not offer it until the Master had manifested to him his purpose of coming quickly." *SITI September 17, 1885, page 568.5*

If Dr. Storrs had studied the Bible as thoroughly as he studied history, he could not have spoken such words, and then have deliberately written them for publication. There is just one correct statement in the paragraph, and that is, that it is not right to pray for death. That is true; it is not right to pray for sudden death, nor for any other kind of death; but it *is* right to pray for the coming of the Lord, and to long for it, as the following texts clearly prove:-*SITI September 17, 1885, page 568.6*

"Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in the earth, as it is in heaven." *Matthew 6:10*. This is what Christ himself commanded us to pray. Now when we read these words: "I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom; Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine." (*2 Timothy 4:1, 2*), we know that the kingdom comes only when Christ comes; therefore Christ taught his disciples that they should daily pray for his coming. *SITI September 17, 1885, page 568.7*

Again, Paul says: "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing." *2 Timothy 4:7, 8*. The crown of life, then, is to be given only to those who love the coming of the Lord. Paul and

Dr. Storrs do not seem to agree on this subject.*SITI September 17, 1885, page 568.8*

We have no disposition to carp at Dr. Storrs. He is an able man, and we admire his talent. He is no more out of the way than are thousands. The trouble with him is, that while in history he searches for himself, and draws his own conclusions, in matters of Bible doctrine he accepts unquestioningly what the multitude believe. From his standpoint, it was very natural to say that we ought not to pray for the coming of the Lord. But what a terrible doctrine it is which obliges its adherents to deliberately throw aside the only hope which Christ left his church. What doctrine does this? The doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul-the theory that men go to heaven at death. The doctrine of the second coming of Christ is the "blessed hope" (*Titus 2:13*), the hope with which Christ comforted his sorrowing disciples; but the dogma of inherent immortality ignores all this.*SITI September 17, 1885, page 568.9*

People sometimes say that it makes no difference what we believe concerning the immortality of the soul; that it is not of any practical importance whether we believe that it is inherently immortal, or dependent on Christ for immortality. Does it make any difference whether or not we believe the words of Christ? Is it a matter of no importance that we lay hold on the only hope that Christ has left us? If there were nothing else against the doctrine of natural immortality, this alone would condemn it. Of course it will not do for people to say that the Lord is not coming at all, for the Bible is full of assertions that he is; and since the people have settled it for themselves that men receive their reward at death, they combine the two. Since the idea is getting so prevalent that death is the coming of the Lord, it is proper for us to devote space to examine it in the light of Scripture.*SITI September 17, 1885, page 569.1*

First, Christ said to his disciples, "If I go away, I will come *again*." He did not promise to come *again and again*, but simply "another time; once more." Paul's words in *Hebrews 9:28* agree with this: "And unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." Now since he comes only once more, it is certain that death cannot be that coming, for death is constantly occurring.*SITI September 17, 1885, page 569.2*

He promised to come “again.” The word “again” indicates another of the same kind. Christ was on the earth in the flesh; he was seen by thousands. Now if he comes “again,” a “second time,” he must come in person. The departure of the soul for Heaven cannot be another advent of Christ. If any think this is a far-fetched argument, let them read the account of Christ’s ascension: “And when he had spoken these things, *while they beheld*, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked stedfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, *shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven.*” *Acts 1:9-11*. No amount of philosophical theorizing can ever wrest that scripture so as to make it teach a coming of the Lord at death. Those who hold to that theory, must deny the statement of the angels. *SITI September 17, 1885, page 569.3*

Something more in the same line. Read *Revelation 1:7*: “Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him.” Every eye does not see when a man dies. Thousands die in solitude, unseen by mortal eye. So here is another text that is either unknown to those who hold that the theory we are considering, or else is denied by them. Moreover, this shows that John knew what he was praying for when he uttered the words found in *Revelation 22:20*. He was not praying for death, but for the Lord to come in the clouds of heaven. Every follower of Christ may and should offer the same prayer. *SITI September 17, 1885, page 569.4*

Still further, we read in *Matthew 24:27*, that “as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be.” Who ever saw or heard of such a phenomena at the death of anyone? It is utterly impossible for a man to believe those words of the Lord, and still believe that death is the coming of Christ. Ought not the words of Christ to be believed rather than the theories of men? *SITI September 17, 1885, page 569.5*

When Christ comes, it is to take his people to himself. He doesn’t

take one before another, as Paul shows in *1 Thessalonians 4:15-17*: “For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord.” *SITI September 17, 1885, page 569.6*

Here we see that both the righteous dead and the righteous living are taken to be with the Lord at the same time, at his coming. And this is just what the same apostle teaches in *2 Timothy 4:6-8*, already quoted. He says that the Lord will give him a crown of righteousness “*at that day*.” At what day? Why, the day referred to in the first verse, when Christ comes in his kingdom to judge the living and dead. “At that day,” says Paul, the Lord will give me a crown, “and not to me only, but to all them also that love his appearing.” Yes, at the coming of the Lord all who love him shall receive a crown, and all at the same time. *SITI September 17, 1885, page 569.7*

Look once more at *1 Thessalonians 4:15*: “We which are alive and remain under the coming of the Lord.” Now if it be true that the “coming of the Lord” is equivalent to “death,” we can substitute the latter word in the verse, and we shall then have the sublimely ridiculous statement that “we which are alive and remain [alive] until death, shall not go before them which are asleep”! If there is one *special class* of persons who live until they die, what becomes of those who do not live until they die? We should like to have Dr. Storrs turn his logical mind to the solving of this conundrum. *SITI September 17, 1885, page 569.8*

We turn to the *second chapter of 2 Thessalonians*. Paul says: “Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind.... as that the day of Christ is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any means; for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called

God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." *Verses 1-4*. Paul assured them that the Lord would not come until after the great apostasy, and the full establishment of the papacy. The papacy was fully established in the sixth century; but would Dr. Storrs have us believe that between the first and sixth centuries no one died? He is too good a historian not to know all about the bloody persecutions during the reign of Nero, Domitian, and others, in which hundreds of Christians yielded up their lives for the faith. Yet Christ could not come until after the setting up of the papacy, and he has not come. *SITI September 17, 1885, page 569.9*

There is scarcely any limit to the texts that might be quoted to show the absurdity of the idea that death is the coming of the Lord. There is just one more passage that we wish to notice. It shows that none of Christ's disciples entertained the idea that death was his coming. Christ had met his disciples at the Sea of Galilee. He had questioned Peter concerning his love, and had showed him by what kind of a death he would be called upon to show his love. Then Peter looked around, and seeing John, asked, "Lord, and what shall this man do?" Jesus answered, "If I will that he tarry till I come? What is that to thee." *John 21:21, 22*. Suppose we substitute death for the coming of the Lord, and then we have the Master saying, "If I will that he tarry [remain alive] until he comes, what is that to thee?" What a horrible doctrine it is that makes such nonsense of our Lord's simple language. *SITI September 17, 1885, page 569.10*

But notice: Just as soon as Jesus asked Peter what difference it was to him if John should live until the coming of the Lord, the disciples, assuming that Christ had declared that John *should* remain until his coming, began to spread abroad the statement that John would never die! They knew very well that death and the coming of the Lord have nothing in common. *SITI September 17, 1885, page 569.11*

If all our readers do not agree with us in saying that the idea that death is the coming of Christ is both absurd and unscriptural, we have underrated their sagacity. If any hold that idea after carefully reading the texts we have quoted, we should be glad to hear from them, that we may together consider the matter further. We do not

care to hear from any who cannot give a reason for their belief. We do not expect to hear from any. May the Lord help all to study well all that relates to the coming of the Lord, and to speedily learn to pray, "Even so, come, Lord Jesus." E. J. W.*SITI September 17, 1885, page 569.12*

October 1, 1885

“The Four Kingdoms of *Daniel 7*” *The Signs of the Times*, 11, 37.

E. J. Waggoner

“In the first year of Belshazzar king of Babylon Daniel had a dream and visions of his head upon his bed: then he wrote the dream, and told the sum of the matters.” *Daniel 7:1*. The exactness of the Bible narrative is worthy of note. “In the first year of Belshazzar king of Babylon.” Concerning Belshazzar as king of Babylon, and the time of his reign, we extract the following from Rawlinson:-*SITI October 1, 1885, page 582.1*

“Nebuchadnezzar expired at Babylon in the forty-fourth year of his reign, B.C. 561, after an illness of no long duration. He was probably little short of eighty years old at his death. The successor of Nebuchadnezzar was his son Evil-Merodach, who reigned only two years, and of whom very little is known.... He had been but two years upon the throne when a conspiracy was formed against him; he was accused of lawlessness and intemperance; his own brother-in-law, Neriglissar, the husband of a daughter of Nebuchadnezzar, headed the malcontents and Evil-Merodach lost his life with his crown. Neriglissar, the successful conspirator, was at once acknowledged king.... Neriglissar reigned from B.C. 559 to B.C. 556, and, dying a natural death in the last-named year, left his throne to his son, Laboroarchod, or Labossoracus. This prince, was a mere boy, and therefore quite unequal to the task of governing a great empire in critical times, was not allowed to retain the crown many months.... On the death of Laboroarchod the conspirators selected one of their number, a certain Nabonadius, or Nabannidochus, and invested him with the sovereignty.... It is probable that one of his first steps on ascending the throne was to connect himself by marriage with the royal house which had preceded him in the kingdom.... Very shortly after the accession of Nabonadius (B.C. 555) he received an embassy from the far northwest.... At the earliest possible moment-probably when he was about fourteen-he had associated with him in the government, his son, Belshazzar, or Bel-sharuzar, the grandson of the great Nebuchadnezzar.”-*Fourth Monarchy, chap. 8, part. 38-50.SITI*

October 1, 1885, page 582.2

This gives us the Babylonian succession from Nebuchadnezzar to the end of the monarchy. The monument contains the names of both Nabonadius and Belshazzar, and for a long time historians thought they referred to the same person. Further research has shown their true relationship. As Belshazzar was left in Babylon, never leaving it, so far as known, he is very properly termed king of Babylon, the more so, as he really held that title, in conjunction with his father. Cyrus, king of Persia, is in one place (*Ezra 5:13*) called the king of Babylon, because that was his capital. As will be noticed, the date in the margin of *Daniel 7:1*, agrees with the historian, in placing the first year Belshazzar in B.C. 555.*SITI October 1, 1885, page 582.3*

“Daniel spake and said, I saw in my vision by night, and, behold, the four winds of the heaven strove upon the great sea. And four great beasts came up from the sea, diverse one from another.” *Daniel 7:2, 3*. The Scriptures never put a man under the necessity of guessing at anything that is intended for him to know—and whatever is revealed is designed for us. *Deuteronomy 29:29*. So we find in this same chapter the clew to unravel the whole thing. In *verse 17* we are told in plain words that “these great beasts which are four, are four kings, which shall arise out of the earth.” And then, showing us that not individual kings but kingdoms are meant, the next verse continues: “But the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever.”*SITI October 1, 1885, page 582.4*

Another thing is shown by *verse 17*. We learn from it that these four kingdoms terminate with the kingdom of God, of which the saints are heirs, and in which they are to dwell for ever. We found that this was the termination of the four kingdoms of *Daniel 2*. Now when we note that these beasts came up one after another (see *verses 4-7*), and that they represent kings that bear rule over all the earth (see *verse 25*), we know that the four kings of *Daniel 7* must be identical with the four kings of *Daniel 2*. For it is an utter impossibility that two series of universal kingdoms should exist in the earth at the same time.*SITI October 1, 1885, page 582.5*

There are two other symbols in this prophecy, but they are easily explained. We know that the winds and the sea are symbolical, for the beasts are symbolical, and literal winds and waters do not produce real kingdoms. Winds blowing on the ocean produce commotion; and since it is as the result of the commotion thus produced that the four kingdom arise, we must conclude that by the blowing of the winds on the sea, wars are indicated, since it is through strife and bloodshed that kingdoms arise. We shall find that prophecy bears us out in this conclusion. *SITI October 1, 1885, page 582.6*

It must be accepted as a fact that when a symbol is once used in a prophecy, with a certain meaning, it must have the same meaning in whatever other prophecy it is found. If this were not so, we would have no harmony in the Bible. By following this principle, all is harmonious. In the 17th of Revelation, John speaks of a woman that he saw, sitting on many waters (*verse 1*), and the angel told him (*verse 15*) that these waters were “peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and kings.” Then the great sea of *Daniel 7*, represents the people of the earth. See also in *Isaiah 8:7*, where the king of Assyria is called “the waters of river.” If the sea means people, then of course the stirring up of the sea, by winds, denotes the stirring up of the people-strife. In harmony with this, we find in *Jeremiah 25:32, 33*, that as a result of a great whirlwind in all the earth, the slain cover all the earth. In *Revelation 7:1-3* the wind,-the fierce passions of men-are represented as being held so that the earth may not be hurt. *SITI October 1, 1885, page 582.7*

The prophecy, then, simply brings to view the four universal empires,-Babylon, Medo-Persia, Grecia, and Rome,-each arising as the result of the ungoverned passions of the people. The first, Babylon, with its power and glory, was represented by a lion, with eagle’s wings. *Daniel 7:4*. It was described as follows: “For, lo, I raise up the Chaldeans, that bitter and hasty nation... Their horses also are swifter than the leopards, and are more fierce than the evening wolves; and their horsemen shall spread themselves, and their horsemen shall come from far; they shall fly as the eagle that hasteth to eat.” *Habakkuk 1:6-8. SITI October 1, 1885, page 582.8*

But the prophet beheld until the wings wherewith it was lifted up

from the earth, were plucked, and it was made to stand on its feet as a man. Instead of flying over the country, in conquest, it came to a full stop. Then the second, Medo-Persia, was represented by a bear with three ribs in its mouth, indicating its ferocious disposition. Calmet, a Catholic commentator, in reference to this passage, says that the Persians have exercised the most severe and the most cruel dominion that we know of. The cruelty of the Medes is described in *Isaiah 13:17, 18*. The third kingdom, Grecia, was represented by the leopard with four wings. Nothing could more fitly represent the Grecian empire under Alexander, whose very name is a synonym for celerity of movement. Says Rollin (Book XV, sec. 2. last part.), "Alexander, in less than eight years, marched his army upwards of seventeen hundred leagues, without including his return to Babylon." And he conquered enemies as he went. *SITI October 1, 1885, page 582.9*

But the fourth beast was the one concerning which Daniel wished information. He knew what they all represented, but the fourth was "dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly; and it had great iron teeth; it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it; and it was diverse from all the beasts that were before it; and it had ten horns." *Daniel 7:7*. It needs no further argument to show that this represents Rome, for the *23rd verse* says: "The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth." For the more full proof that the fourth kingdom is Rome, see note in preceding number of the SIGNS *SITI October 1, 1885, page 582.10*

"And the ten horns are ten kings that shall arise." *Verse 24*. This does not refer to ten *successive* kingdoms, because, "Another shall arise after them, and he shall subdue three kings." When the little horn arose, he plucked up three of the first horns by the roots. *Verse 8*. If the ten came up one after another, then there would simply have been eleven kings; and he could not have plucked up three out of the ten as he came up, if all had not existed at once. The ten horns refer to the ten divisions of Western Rome. While different commentators have differed slightly as to the names of these divisions, all agree that they were formed, and that they exist to-day as the various States of Europe. *SITI October 1, 1885, page 582.11*

These divisions are also indicated by the toes of the image. We know this from the statement that “in the days of these kings shall the God of Heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed.” *Daniel 2:44*. The expression, “these kings,” could not by any possibility refer to the four kingdoms, for the kingdom of God could not be set up in the days of all of them, since one succeeded the other. It could not have been set up in the days of Babylon, and also in the days of Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome. Not until after the division of Rome, which took place in the fifth century, was that kingdom to be set up. When it is set up, it will fill the whole earth, to the exclusion of all human governments. *SITI October 1, 1885, page 582.12*

Comments on the kingdom represented by the little horn, must necessarily be reserve for other lessons. E. J. W. *SITI October 1, 1885, page 582.13*

“The Lord’s Sabbath Definite” The Signs of the Times, 11, 37.

E. J. Waggoner

“The great majority of Christians believe that the [fourth] commandment only requires the observance of one day in seventh, and that it believes the children of God at liberty to select the day, and they accordingly accept the first instead of the seventh day, because tradition and the habit of the church have hallowed it.”-*Christian Union. SITI October 1, 1885, page 584.1*

We quote these words simply because they do express the belief of the “great majority of Christians,” and therefore in what we say it may not seem that we are beating the air. We wish to call attention to the fourth commandment, and to the popular belief concerning it, in such a way that all who desire truth may be able to discern it. *SITI October 1, 1885, page 584.2*

1. What reason have the great majority of Christians, or any class of people, whether few or many, to believe that the fourth commandment requires the observance of one day in seventh, and not a definitely specified day? Is not the commandment plain enough in its declarations and injunctions? Let us read it and see.

“Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.” Literally it reads, “Remember *the day of the Sabbath*.” That certainly carries the idea of definiteness. Our attention is called not to “the Sabbath institution,” but to “the Sabbath *day*.” It is “*the Sabbath day*,” indicating that there is only one, just as we say *the Lord*, for a while there be “lords many,” to us “there is but one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things.” Different people may have Sabbaths of their own, but the Bible knows but one Sabbath.*SITI October 1, 1885, page 584.3*

Having indicated that there is but one Sabbath, and that it is a definite day, the commandment goes on to tell what day the Sabbath is. “Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but *the seventh day is the Sabbath* of the Lord thy God; in it thou shall not do any work.” Here is a definiteness. The Sabbath is “the seventh day.” Note that it is not said, nor are we warranted in saying that the Sabbath comes, or did come, on the seventh day, but that the Sabbath *is* the seventh day. The seventh day and the Sabbath are inseparable. When God said, “Remember the Sabbath day,” it was the same as though he said, “Remember the seventh day.” And after it has been stated that “the seventh day is the Sabbath,” when it is said that “God blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it,” we know that God blessed the seventh day, and hallowed *it*.*SITI October 1, 1885, page 584.4*

This point is made emphatic in *Genesis 2:3*, to which the command of refers: “And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created in made.” If anyone thinks there is any doubt as to which day of the week the seventh day is, let him consult the almanac, the dictionary, or the first man he may meet on the street. Ask your neighbor some Sunday morning, “What day of the week is to-day?” and without an instant’s hesitation he will answer, “The first.” Read the extract at the beginning of this article, where it is said that “the great majority of Christians” observe the first day of the week *instead* of the seventh; and knowing that “the day called Sunday” is the popular day of “rest and recreation,” you can have no trouble in accounting and determining which is the seventh day.*SITI October 1, 1885, page 584.5*

That there may be no possibility for doubt, we will state another point, which has often been noted. The crucifixion of Christ, as is generally conceded, was on Friday; the record says, "And that day was the preparation, and the Sabbath drew on." *Luke 23:54*. "And the women... followed after, and beheld the sepulcher, and how his body was laid. And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment. Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulcher, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them." *Luke 23:55, 56; 24:1*. No first-day advocates ever dreams that these events did not occurs in order on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday; and concede that the day on which the women rested was *the seventh day of the week*, because it immediately preceded the first day of the week. Therefore it is as clear as a mathematical demonstration that the fourth commandment declares the seventh day of the week to be the Sabbath. Now then, we ask, What right have "the great majority of Christians" to believe that the commandment requires simply one-seventh portion of our time, and not rest on a definite day? What right has anybody to so believe? None whatever. There is no excuse for such a belief on the part of one who can read the commandment. *SITI October 1, 1885, page 585.1*

2. Suppose that the commandment did leave it optional with us, as to which day we would observe, what would be the result? Nothing but confusion. If the commandment does not specify any day to be observed, then one person has as much liberty of choice as another. If it were so, then no man would have any right to require another for differing with him. Every man would be a law unto himself. It is a fact, however, that the majority of people do not believe that the commandment leaves to individuals the choice of selecting the day upon which they will rest; if they did so believe, they would exercise their right, and there would not be the uniformity which we now see. If there is uniformity of practice, some one must be recognized as competent to declare which day must be observed. This leads directly to popery, and it is a fact that Roman Catholics are the only Sunday-keepers whose practice is consistent with their profession. Given these two things, definiteness in the commandment, and the desirability of uniformity

of practice, and a pope is an absolute necessity. For ourselves we will accept no pope, nor the dogmas of a pope, and the commandment does not lay us under any such necessity. It is as plain and definite as Infinite Wisdom could make it. *SITI October 1, 1885, page 585.2*

3. The people have accepted the first day, “because tradition and the habit of the church have hallowed it.” And that is indeed all the hallowing that the first day of the week has ever received, and that is just none at all. Can the custom or decision of any man determine the sacredness of a day? No. Can the custom and decision of *two* men hallow the day. No; and so all will say. Then the question arises, How many men does it take to reverse the decrees of God, and make wrong right? If in comparison with God the inhabitants of the earth “are as grasshoppers” (*Isaiah 40:22*), and all “the nations are as a drop of a bucket, and are counted as the small dust of the balance,” yea, even as “less than nothing, and vanity” (*verses 15, 17*), then the custom and decision of a majority of the people of the earth, or even of *all* of them, are of themselves of no more account than the custom and decision of a single man. *SITI October 1, 1885, page 585.3*

Man is sinful; he cannot hallow anything. Even if he were perfect, his power to hallow anything would be no greater. The mightiest angel in Heaven could not hallow any day which God had not hallowed. “God hath spoken one; twice have I heard this; that power belongeth unto God.” *Psalms 62:11*. The “tradition and the habit of the church,” when contrary to the word of God, are of no more consequence than the tradition and habit of infidels or pagans. *SITI October 1, 1885, page 585.4*

Compare the two days. Of the seventh day of the week it is said that “God blessed the seventh day and hallowed it.” The most that can be said of the first day of the week, is that “tradition and the habit of the church have hallowed it.” God hallowed the seventh; man “hallowed” the first. Reader, which will you choose? Whom will you obey? “Choose you this day whom ye will serve;” whether the Lord Jehovah, or the apostate church of Rome. May God help you to remember that under *all* circumstances “we ought to obey God rather than men.” E. J. W. *SITI October 1, 1885, page 585.5*

October 8, 1885

“The Sure Foundation” The Signs of the Times, 11, 38.

E. J. Waggoner

“If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?” *Psalm 11:3.SITI October 8, 1885, page 601.1*

Every structure that is of any account must be built upon a foundation. In the close of the sermon on the mount, our Saviour graphically but accurately describes the consequence of building without any foundation. When “the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house,” it fell, because it was built upon the sand. The same thing would have happened to the house which was built upon a foundation, if the foundation could been removed. The tendency of the present age is to superficiality, but a good, solid foundation is nevertheless as necessary as it ever was.*SITI October 8, 1885, page 601.2*

We believe that “the foundations,” to which the psalmist refers in the text just quoted, are nothing else than the law of God-the ten commandment. To demonstrate this is the object of this article. The psalmist continues in the next verse: “The Lord is in his holy temple, the Lord’s throne is in heaven; his eyes behold, his eyelids try, the children of men.” This shows that there is an intimate connection between “the foundations,” and the throne of God and the temple in heaven. What this connection is, we proceed to show.*SITI October 8, 1885, page 601.3*

In the *25th chapter of Exodus* we find directions concerning the building of the sanctuary. The sanctuary was to be a dwelling-place for God. See *verse 8*. From the 26th chapter we learn that it was an oblong building, and inclosed on three sides with boards, and on the fourth by a cloth curtain, and that by a similar curtain it was divided into two apartments-the holy place and the most holy place. In the holy place there was an altar of incense, a golden candlesticks, and a table of show-bread. *Exodus 40:22-27*. In the most holy place was the ark of the testimony (*Exodus 26:37*), and it is to this that we wish to call especial attention.*SITI October 8,*

This ark was a wooden box overlaid and lined with pure gold. Its cover was termed the “mercy-seat,” and was of solid gold, having on each end a cherub beaten out of the same piece of pure gold. “And the cherubim shall stretch forth their wings on high, covering the mercy seat with their wings, and their faces shall look one to another; toward the mercy seat shall the faces of the cherubim. And thou shalt put the mercy seat above upon the ark; and in the ark thou shalt put the testimony that I shall give thee.” *Exodus 25:20, 21*. Read carefully the preceding verses. *SITI October 8, 1885, page 601.5*

What this “testimony” was, we easily find by the comparison of a few texts of Scripture. In *Exodus 24:12* we read: “And the Lord said unto Moses, Come up to me into the mount, and be there; and I will give thee tables of stone, and a law, and commandments which I have written; that thou mayest teach them.” Moses went up, and was there forty days and forty nights, during which time he received the instructions found in chapters 25-31. After noting these instructions, the sacred narrative continues: “And he gave unto Moses, when he had made an end of communing with him upon Mount Sinai, two tables of testimony, tables of stone, written with the finger of God.” *Exodus 31:18*. *SITI October 8, 1885, page 601.6*

We notice that the tables of testimony were tables of stone. Tracing them further, we find (*Exodus 32:15-19*) that when Moses came down from the mount, with the two tables in his hand, he broke them at the foot of the mount, in his righteous anger at the idolatry of the people. This experience is detailed by Moses in the *9th of Deuteronomy*, and in the *10th chapter* he proceeds with the narrative as follows: -*SITI October 8, 1885, page 601.7*

“At that time the Lord said unto me, Hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first, and come up unto me into the mount, and make thee an ark of wood. And I will write on the tables the words that were in the first tables which thou brakest, and thou shalt put them in the ark. And I made an ark of shittim wood, and hewed two tables of stone like unto the first, and went up into the mount, having the two tables in mine hand. And he wrote on the tables, according to

the first writing, the ten commandments, which the Lord spake unto you in the mount out of the midst of the fire in the day of the assembly; and the Lord gave them unto me. And I turned myself and came down from the mount, and put the tables in the ark which I had made; and there they be, as the Lord commanded me.” *Deuteronomy 10:1-5.SITI October 8, 1885, page 601.8*

We have now positive assurance that the “testimony” that was placed in the ark was the ten commandments, and that it was on this account that the ark of was called “the ark of the testimony.” Now note again in *Exodus 25*, that the cover to the ark was called the “mercy-seat,” and that upon it were two cherubim, one on each end. The Lord said: “And thou shalt put the mercy seat above upon the ark; and in the ark thou shalt put the testimony that I shall give thee. And there I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy seat, from between the two cherubim which are upon the ark of the testimony, of all things which I will give thee in commandment unto the children of Israel.” *Exodus 25:21, 22.* God dwelt between the cherubim upon the mercy-seat above the testimony, and it was this that made it necessary for the high priest to burn incense when he ministered in the most holy place. The cloud of incense veiled the glory of God, which obscured, would have caused his death. *Leviticus 16:3, 13.SITI October 8, 1885, page 601.9*

Now to the point of all this. The Jewish tabernacle, and all things connected with it, were patterned after something that Moses had seen in the mount. *Exodus 25:9, 40.* They were “patterns of the things in the heavens;” and “the holy places made with hands” were only “figures of the true” holy places in Heaven. *Hebrews 9:23, 24.* There must be, then, a real tabernacle in Heaven, and this is plainly stated in *Hebrews 8:1, 2*: “Now of the things which we have spoken this is the sum; we have such an high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man.” *SITI October 8, 1885, page 601.10*

“A minister of *the sanctuary.*” There is but one, since that built by Moses was only a miniature representation of the true tabernacle in the heavens, which the Lord pitched. This temple in Heaven has

been seen by mortal eye. The beloved disciple says: "And the temple of God was opened in Heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his Testament." *Revelation 11:19*. This temple in Heaven is the special dwelling-place of God. "The Lord is in his holy temple; let all the earth keep silence before him." *Habakkuk 2:20*. "The Lord is in his holy temple, the Lord's throne is in heaven." *Psalms 11:4*. *SITI October 8, 1885, page 601.11*

We already noted that not only the tabernacle, but all its furniture, was modeled after things in the heavens. Said the Lord to Moses: "According to all that I show thee, after the pattern of the tabernacle, and the pattern of all the instruments thereof, even so shall ye make it." *Exodus 25:9*. After giving directions concerning the ark, the table, and the candlestick, he repeated the injunction: "And look that thou make them after their pattern, which we showed thee in the mount." *Exodus 25:40*. Accordingly we find (*Revelation 11:19*) that the ark of the testament is one of the things in the temple in heaven. *SITI October 8, 1885, page 601.12*

Now remember that in the earthly tabernacle God's dwelling-place was above the ark, between the cherubim that were upon the mercy-seat. *Exodus 25:21, 22; Leviticus 16:3, 13*. Then since the earthly tabernacle was a type of God's real dwelling-place, the temple in Heaven, it must be that the ark of the testament was a figure of God's throne in heaven. To corroborate this conclusion, we read that God's real dwelling-place is between the cherubim. Says David, in prayer to God: "Give ear, O Shepherd of Israel, thou that leadest Joseph like a flock; that dwellest between the cherubim, shine forth." *Psalms 80:1*. Again: "The Lord reigneth; let the people tremble; he sitteth between the cherubim; let the earth be moved." *Psalms 99:1*. Here the fact that God *reigns* is connected with his sitting between the cherubim, showing conclusively that when reigning upon his throne he is between the cherubim. God sits between the cherubim; he reigns; therefore the people should tremble. When Hezekiah was in trouble, he "prayed for the Lord, and said, O Lord God of Israel, which dwellest between the cherubim, thou art God, even thou alone, of all the kingdoms of the earth; thou hast made heaven and earth." *2 Kings 19:15*. And the Lord, speaking of Satan under the figure of the king of Tyre, said: "Thou art the anointed cherub that covereth; and I have set thee so;

thou wast upon the holy mountain of God; thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire.”*SITI October 8, 1885, page 601.13*

These texts show plainly that the cherubim upon the mercy-seat, from between which God spoke to the people, were representations of the cherubim that cover the throne of God in heaven, and that therefore the mercy-seat, supported by the ark, was a figure of God’s throne. This is why the most holy place and the ark were considered so sacred.*SITI October 8, 1885, page 601.14*

But if the ark and the mercy-seat were a representation of God’s throne, then the tables of testimony-the ten commandments-which it contained must be considered as showing the relation existing between the real throne of God in heaven and the original copy of the ten commandments. The ark existed for the sole purpose of holding the law, and therefore the ten commandments must be considered as forming the foundation of God’s throne. David says: “The Lord reigneth; let the earth rejoice; let the multitude of isles be glad thereof. Clouds and darkness are round about him; righteousness and judgment are the habitation of his throne.” *Psalms 97:1, 2*. Now when we read (*Psalms 119:172*) that God’s commandments are righteousness, and further, that they are God’s righteousness (*Isaiah 51:6, 7*), we are assured that the ten commandments which God spoke from Sinai, and which were copied on tables of stone, form the foundation of God’s throne.*SITI October 8, 1885, page 601.15*

A throne is the symbol of royal power and authority. We speak of “the throne of England,” meaning the Government of England; therefore we state the literal fact, that the ten commandment are the foundation of God’s throne, it is equivalent to saying that they formed the basis of God’s Government; that all of God’s judgments are in harmony with them, and that they cover every act of his in the government of his creatures.*SITI October 8, 1885, page 601.16*

From these facts thus briefly stated, the following conclusions are evident:-*SITI October 8, 1885, page 601.17*

1. The law of God-the ten commandments-is the law of the universe. “The Lord hath prepared his throne in the heavens; and

his kingdom ruleth over all.” *Psalm 103:19*. Not only this earth, but all the world and the Heaven of heavens are subject to his authority, and amenable to his holy law. The highest angel in Heaven, and the lowest saint on earth; the arch deceiver and the most simple of his deluded victims, are alike judged by that perfect law. No righteous act or thought is outside of its sanctions, and no evil can be conceived that it does not condemn. *SITI October 8, 1885, page 602.1*

2. The law of God was in existence before the creation of the earth. When the foundations of the world were laid, “the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy.” *Job 38:4-7*. The “sons of God” were the subjects of his righteous Government, and therefore subject to the law of God, which is the basis of that Government. In proof of this, and also of the preceding proposition, read *Psalm 103:20*: “Bless, the Lord, ye his angels, that excel in strength, that do his commandments, harkening unto the voice of his word.” Since the ten commandment law is *perfect* contains, as we have seen, all the principles of God’s Government, there can be no other commandments for the angels to obey. All commands of God are comprised within the precepts of Sinai. *SITI October 8, 1885, page 602.2*

3. The ten commandments can never have any end. Since they are the foundation of God’s throne, they must endure as long as it endures, and it must endure as long as God himself exists, for if he were not Supreme Ruler he would not be God. Now listen to the sublime words of the psalmist: “Lord, thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations. Before the mountains were brought forth or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God.” *Psalm 90:1, 2*. More emphatic language could not be used. But since it is impossible for God to exist apart from his Government, that must also be to everlasting, and the ten commandments, the basis of that Government, must have an equal duration. *SITI October 8, 1885, page 602.3*

4. The law of God, is unchangeable. Not only can it not be abolished, but not one of its precepts can undergo the slightest alteration. We speak not of mere verbal changes which do not

affect the sense, but of changes in the force or application of law. Since the law is the foundation of God's throne, its 10 precepts may be considered as the ten pillars constituting the foundation. It was doubtless with this idea in mind that Bishop E. O. Haven named his book which contained his ten sermons on the law, "The Pillars of Truth." When workmen wish to make any repairs in the foundation of a building, they put up a prop underneath, to take the place of the defective foundation while repairs are being made. But what can be placed under the throne of the universe to uphold it while repairs are being made in any of its corner-stones? Nothing. Men may theorize about a change in the fourth commandment, but such a change is an impossibility. To make it would be to make a revolution in the Government of Heaven. It may be urged that God has power to make such a change, but one thing God cannot do: He cannot deny himself. "If we believe not, yet he abide faithful; He cannot deny himself." *2 Timothy 2:13*. God's law is his will (*Romans 2:17, 18*); it is his righteousness; a transcript of his own nature; a photograph of his character. Therefore for God to make a change in the law would show that his character had undergone a change, and that is an impossibility. With him is "no variableness, neither shadow of turning." *James 1:17*. If his law was the truth in the days of David (*Psalms 119:142*), it could not be changed without becoming a lie, and it is only the enemies of God who seek to do this. These facts absolutely prove the proposition that God's law is absolutely unchangeable. They enable us to better appreciate the words of the psalmist: "Thy word is truth from the beginning; and everyone of thy righteous judgments endureth for ever." *Psalms 119:160*. *SITI October 8, 1885, page 602.4*

5. It follows as a necessary conclusion, that the saints through all eternity will yield obedience to the law. To do otherwise would make them no more saints, but traitors. Some people tell us that a righteous man has no need for the law of God. But the psalmist thought otherwise, for He said: "If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?" *Psalms 11:3*. To say that because God's people are all righteous, therefore they have no need of the law, is like saying that because no one falls over a precipice at the top of which a strong barrier has been erected, therefore the barrier is unnecessary. None are more interested than the righteous, in

having the law of God preserved intact through the ages of eternity. It alone attests their loyalty to God. It is to them a sure pledge that no power in the universe can endanger their rights as subjects of the God of Heaven. It shows them that it is not in vain that they make the eternal God their refuge, and that he who in his excellency rides upon the heavens to the help of his people, is abundantly able to protect all who put their trust in him. *SITI October 8, 1885, page 602.5*

May the Lord hasten the day when his kingdom shall come; when his will shall be done in all the earth even as it is now done in Heaven (see *Psalms 119:20*); when his children shall all be righteous; when "his servants shall serve him; and they shall see his face; and his name shall be in their foreheads." E. J. W. *SITI October 8, 1885, page 602.6*

October 15, 1885

“Tributes to the Bible” *The Signs of the Times*, 11, 39.

E. J. Waggoner

Quite frequently we have received articles which contain quotations from some eminent men, perhaps an infidel, who has been compelled to testify to the simplicity and beautiful consistency of the Bible, and of the Christian religion. At almost regular intervals we see such tributes in certain religious journalists, prominent among these tributes being Napoleon Bonaparte’s testimony concerning our Lord, which he gave while on the island of St. Helena. *SITI October 15, 1885, page 617.1*

Perhaps some of our readers may have noticed the absence of such quotations from the columns of the SIGNS. There is a reason why they do not appear. That is, we do not believe that the Bible stands in any need of such tributes, or that it gains anything from them. Says Paul, “And without all contradiction the less is blessed of the better.” *Hebrews 7:7*. Therefore for men to give their solemn indorsement of the Bible and of Jesus Christ, is a reversal of the correct order of things. Especially is this so when those men are, or have been as long as they had opportunity, notoriously wicked men. If the Bible commends a man, it is the highest honor that can be given to human kind; it is more than all else in the world, and all that any man needs. To have any man commend the Bible, adds not one whit to its authenticity or force; and to quote such commendation seems to us to be ridiculous. *SITI October 15, 1885, page 617.2*

Further than this, we do not believe that the Bible needs to be “defended.” Even if it did need to be defended, who shall defend it? Is it not rather turning things around to speak of a man defending the Bible? May it not be truly said of the Bible: “For thou hast been a strength to the poor, a strength to the needy in distress, a refuge from the storm, a shadow from the heat, when the blast of the terrible ones is as a storm against the wall”? Is it proper to speak of *defending* that from which we derive our sustenance, and upon which we depend for our lives? *SITI October 15, 1885, page 617.3*

The Bible is abundantly able to defend itself. We may expound it, and draw from the depths the wonderful truths which alone are capable of overthrowing error, but that is simply letting the Bible speak for itself. All the arguments that can be drawn from outside sources to meet the assaults of skepticism, are worthless when compared with a plain statement of some Bible doctrine. When the most profound argument in proof of the divine origin of the Bible have utterly failed to convert an infidel from the error of his ways, a clear exposition of the prophecies, and that the teaching of the Bible on the nature of man, the fate of the wicked, and the reward of the righteous, have often proved successful. And we will here say that if this latter method will not cause an infidel to see the folly of his position, no other method need be tried.*SITI October 15, 1885, page 617.4*

Said Jesus: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth shall be damned." That is all. "Preach the word." Let the light from the sacred word shine forth in all its clearness, and the word which is "quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow," will surely convict every soul that is not hopelessly entangled in the snares of Satan. That word carries with it its own defense; it bears the indorsement of heaven. To those who will not accept it *entirely*, there is but one alternative.*SITI October 15, 1885, page 617.5*

"The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream; and he that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully. What is the chaff to the wheat? saith the Lord. Is not my word like as a fire? saith the Lord; and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces?" *Jeremiah 23:29, 29. E. J. W. SITI October 15, 1885, page 617.6*

"One Cause of Unbelief" The Signs of the Times, 11, 39.

E. J. Waggoner

A long letter has just been received at this office, from a man in the State of New York. We have not read the letter, and do not know that we shall find time to read it before the holiday vacation, but we

have read a part of the first page. We gather from what we have read, that the writer has some views on the Bible which differ from those of his brethren. Now we do not wish to discourage investigation, or to shut out new light, yet we consider ourselves justified in condemning this writer's views without reading them. Perhaps if we quote a part only of what we have read it, the reader will not charge us with making a hasty decision. Here it is:-*SITI October 15, 1885, page 617.7*

"I will first try and tell you the reason why I have not exactly agreed with the church; I shall by the Lord's help try to tell the truth.¹ Because most of them, and especially the rulers, have, as I have yjought, slighted me," etc.*SITI October 15, 1885, page 617.8*

We have no need to read further. We have heard his story dozens of times. "My brethren have slighted meet, therefore I cannot agree with them in points of faith." We meet a man whom we used to know as a brother, and learn that he has left the church, and renounced his profession. What is the reason? "Well, brother—did not use me well, and the rest of them got to thinking that they were better than I; so I left." Brother A or Elder B has slighted me, therefore I do not believe that "the seventh day is the Sabbath." I think my brethren feel above me, therefore it is evident to my mind that the Bible is not true. Is not that profound logic? Yet it is the only basis there is for a large portion of the turning away from the faith.*SITI October 15, 1885, page 617.9*

The first case of an apostasy for such a cause was that of Satan. He felt slighted, and therefore he would not accept the fundamental truth that God is Supreme Governor. And whenever we hear people preface their objections with the statement, "I have been slighted," we naturally think that they are actuated by some of the same spirit which caused the great rebellion in heaven. Such persons have cause to tremble lest their case becomes as hopeless as that of the first grumbler.*SITI October 15, 1885, page 617.10*

When people begin to imagine that they are slighted, and are not rated according to their abilities, they may be sure that they are thinking of themselves more highly than they ought to think. Their brethren, no doubt, have not changed their behavior toward them,

and rate them at their true worth. It is very seldom that a man's opinion of himself is more correct than that of all his brethren. But whether the slight be real or fancied, it is certainly the lamest excuse for unbelief that was ever invented; and when any man wants us to give a hearing to his new ideas, he must not make, as a cause for holding them, the statement that he has been slighted by the church. E. J. W. *SITI October 15, 1885, page 617.11*

October 22, 1885

“Some Facts about Roman Catholicism” *The Signs of the Times*, 11, 40.

E. J. Waggoner

A few weeks ago we received the following letter from a gentle man in Livermore, Cal., with an accompanying request that it be published at our convenience. Accordingly we give it publicity, as a matter of interest to our readers:-*SITI October 22, 1885, page 633.1*

“EDITOR OF THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES: Having received a few numbers of the SIGNS from a friend here, I have been reading some of Mrs. E. G. White’s articles, and had begun to think that much good would accrue to Christians, as argued from her religious stand-point. But when, in the issue of August 20, in an article entitled ‘Protestantism and Catholicism Uniting,’ that lady assailed that ancient ark of truth, the Church of Rome, I must say that the writer stepped ‘down and out’ of her sphere of usefulness, and lowered pen to the trickery of Pixley and the fiction of Eugene Lawrence; and, moreover, I charge her with violating one of God’s commandments.*SITI October 22, 1885, page 633.2*

“Another charge that stands against such writings is that of desiring to menace the peace of our country by stirring up the demons of religious prejudice and bigotry. It is insulting to the intelligence and liberality of the age we live in, for Protestant writers to use such methods of argument against that large body of Christians who acknowledge and follow the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church. What does the writer mean by the following rather mysterious sentence in the article I refer to: ‘The people of our land need to be aroused to resist this dangerous foe to civil and religious liberty’? I challenge the writer for an explanation of how, when, and wherein is Catholicism a foe to civil and religious liberty. Facts, not fiction, are wanted.*SITI October 22, 1885, page 633.3*

“Another sentence that may well bring the blush to the cheek of intelligence: ‘A prayerful study of the Bible would show Protestants the *real character* of the papacy.’ The truth, Mr. Editor, needs not the support of dark insinuation and mysteriously clouded sentences.

It is an easy matter for these Protestant writers to erect an imaginary gibbets, and manufacture imaginary instruments of persecution and torture, and array them as the work of the dim and distant ages of the past, with which to terrify and intimidate the weak minded of this world; but for the earnest seeker after truth, nothing but the naked facts and the ever-unchanging truth will stand the test of investigation.*SITI October 22, 1885, page 633.4*

"I agree with the writer when she says that '*Rome never changes.*' Her principles, founded on the Holy Scriptures, never change. The truth does not change.*SITI October 22, 1885, page 633.5*

"In regard to the Bible, there is another charge made frequently against the Roman Catholic Church, that of 'banishing the Bible from the Christian world.' What a preposterous idea! Comment is unnecessary, since the Bible can be seen in every Catholic house,- the only pure and unadulterated word of God. I would ask Mrs. E. G. White, Who is responsible for the recent revision of the Bible? Was this Rome's doing? Why is the sacred book curtailed, perverted, assailed, and, I may say, torn asunder leaf by leaf? Is the pope doing this? Why is even the definitive Christ being denied in your modern Protestant pulpits? and even [it is taught that] the ten commandments are to be disobeyed. The charge I lay at the doors of your modern Protestantism."*SITI October 22, 1885, page 633.6*

The above is the entire letter, with the exception of the last paragraph, which contains no new statement. We have given it, in order that we may have the opportunity of once more showing the reason why we are uncompromisingly opposed to Catholicism. But first we would say that the writer cannot have given Mrs. E. G. White writings a very careful reading, or he would not charge her with using "dark insinuations and mysteriously clouded sentences." As a rule, her writings are characterized by clearness and directness of expression, and concerning the Catholic Church she has given most decided utterance. Now to a consideration of the letter. The point over which the writer seems to be aggrieved is, that Catholicism is a foe to the civil and religious liberty. We therefore quote a few facts, not fiction.*SITI October 22, 1885, page 633.7*

On Dec. 8, 1864, Pope Pius IX. published the Papal "Syllabus of

Errors.” This document, also issued by his sole authority, became in an especial manner the utterance of the Catholic Church, when, less than eight years later, Pius IX. still being pope, the doctrine of papal infallibility was declared. In this Syllabus there are eighty distinct propositions, but each of which is held by the Catholic Church to be an error. We quote two of them:-*SITI October 22, 1885, page 633.8*

“77. In the present day, it is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion shall be held as the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of other modes of worship.*SITI October 22, 1885, page 633.9*

“78. Whence it has been wisely provided by law, in some countries called Catholic, that persons coming to reside therein shall enjoy the public exercise of their own worship.”*SITI October 22, 1885, page 633.10*

To men who love liberty these propositions seem just, but the Catholic Church declares them to be errors, and thus plainly teaches that no Catholics ought to be allowed to enjoy public worship. If this does not show that the Catholic Church is the foe of religious liberty, what would?*SITI October 22, 1885, page 633.11*

In the reign of Hildebrand, the priests were bound by an oath of obedience to the pope, of which the following are a few clauses:-*SITI October 22, 1885, page 633.12*

“I will be faithful and obedient to our lord the pope and his successors.... In preserving and defending the Roman papacy and the Regalia of St. Peter, I will be their assistant against all men.... Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our same lord, I will persecute and attack to the utmost of my power.”-*Decretum Greg. IX., lib.2, tit. 24.SITI October 22, 1885, page 633.13*

That certainly does not bear the stamp of liberty. That the Roman Church is a foe to liberty is also shown by its enmity to the Bible. This charge the gentleman calls a falsehood, but we repeat it, and offer *facts* for proof. After Luther had posted up his famous “Theses,” directed especially against the sale of indulgences, Tetzel, the agent of the pope, came out with some counter

propositions, among which is the following:-*SITI October 22, 1885, page 633.14*

“Christian should be taught that there are many things which the church regards as certain articles of the Catholic faith, although they are not found either in the inspired Scripture or in the earlier Fathers.”-*Seckendorf, Hist. Lutheran., lib., 1, sec.12.SITI October 22, 1885, page 633.15*

If the Catholic Church is a friend to the Bible, how is it that, previous to the Reformation, not only the laity, but also the vast majority of the clergy, had never seen a Bible? Why was it so sedulously kept from the people that even very few priests had ever seen a copy of it? The fact is, that Wycliffe was condemned as a heretic and a sacrilegious man, simply because he gave the Bible to the people of England; and in 1408, an English council, with Archbishop Arundel at its head, enacted and ordained “that no one henceforth do, by his own authority, translate any portion of Holy Scripture into the English tongue, or any other, by way of book or a treatise, nor let any such book or treatise now lately composed in the time of John Wycliffe aforesaid, or since, or hereafter to be composed, be read in whole or in part, in public or in private, on the pain of the greater excommunication.” Thus this popish council decreed that not only should Wycliffe’s translation be taken from the people, but that in no coming age should they have any portion of the Bible in any living language.*SITI October 22, 1885, page 633.16*

But Bibles were printed in spite of papal anathemas, and soon the land was filled with them. Now what did the Roman Church do? It would have brought upon itself the condemnation of all virtuous people if it had continued its outspoken denunciations of the Bible, so, while pretending to exalt that book, it began to weaken its influence. Any one who possesses a Catholic catechism will find there a plain statement to the effect that common people are at full liberty to read the Bible, provided they do so in the original! That is, the farmer and the hod carrier, the brick layer and the errand boy, may read the Bible in Greek and Hebrew! This amounts to actual prohibition.*SITI October 22, 1885, page 633.17*

But this is not all. The Catholic Church gives her children a version

of the Bible, but in it she has not scrupled to alter the text to suit her own dogmas. As an instance we quote *Genesis 3:15* as it stands in the Douay Bible, and also in the Vulgate: "And I will put enmity between thee the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; she shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise her heel." In this matter a prophecy concerning Christ is made to uphold the Catholic worship of the Virgin Mary.*SITI October 22, 1885, page 633.18*

Speaking of the Virgin Mary, we will notice one or two points which show the papal disregard for the Holy Scriptures. In *Deuteronomy 27:15*, we read these plain words: "Cursed be the man that maketh any graven or molten image, an abomination unto the Lord, the work of the hands of the craftsman, and putteth it in a secret place." In the face of the second commandment, in this curse, a book entitled "Glories of Mary," published with the approval of the Archbishop of New York, on page 658 contains the following:-*SITI October 22, 1885, page 633.19*

"Father Thomas Sanchez never returned home until he had visited some church of Mary. Let us not be weary, then, of visiting our queen every day in some church or chapel, or in our own house, where it would be well for that purpose to have in some retired place a little oratory, with her image, adorned with drapery, flowers, tapirs for lamps, and before it also the litanies, the rosary, etc., may be said."*SITI October 22, 1885, page 633.20*

Again, the apostle Peter, speaking of Christ, said: "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." *Acts 4:12*. But in the "Glories of Mary," page 279, among other blasphemous things we find the following:-*SITI October 22, 1885, page 633.21*

"In the Franciscan chronicles it is related of Brother Leo, that he once saw a red ladder, upon which Jesus Christ was standing, and a white one, upon which stood his holy mother. He sought persons attempting to ascend the red ladder; they ascended a few steps, and then fell; they ascended again, and again fell. Then they were exhorted to ascend the white ladder, and on that he saw them succeed; for the blessed virgin offered them her hand, and they arrived in that manner safe in Paradise."*SITI October 22, 1885,*

page 633.22

Again, on page 177:-*SITI October 22, 1885, page 633.23*

“St. Bonaventure, moreover, says that Mary is called the gate of heaven, because no one can enter into heaven if he does not pass through Mary, who is the door of it.”*SITI October 22, 1885, page 633.24*

And again, we read on page 17:-*SITI October 22, 1885, page 633.25*

“If the assertion is true and incontrovertible, as I believe it to be, and as I shall prove in the fifth chapter of this book, that all races are dispensed by the hand of Mary alone, and that all those too are saved, are saved solely by the means of this divine Mother; it may be said as a necessary consequence, that the salvation of all depends upon preaching Mary and confidence in her intercession.”*SITI October 22, 1885, page 633.26*

We might quote pages to the same effect, but these quotations are sufficient to show that Catholicism is essentially an anti-Christian religion.*SITI October 22, 1885, page 633.27*

How about those “imaginary gibbets” and “imaginary instruments of persecution and torture” with which Protestant writers are said to “terrify and intimidate the weak minded of this world.” Since *facts* are wanted on this point, we have selected the article on page 635, entitled “Tortures of the Inquisition.” The instruments there mentioned are not imaginary; and, since “Rome never changes,” and this very year Monsignor Capel has repeatedly defended (not apologized for) the Inquisition, and has contended that the heretic is as worthy of punishment as the thief or murderer, we are fully justified in saying that the papal church would as readily torture heretics to-day and as did three hundred years ago.*SITI October 22, 1885, page 633.28*

It is a matter of fact, not of fiction, that on the 23rd of August, 1572, thousands of the Huguenots were brutally murdered in Paris, by order of the Catholic king, Charles IX., who himself joined in the massacre, and that the massacre received the sanction of the

pope. *SITI October 22, 1885, page 633.29*

It is a *fact* of history that on the 18th of October, 1414, the Emperor Sigmund sent to John Huss a safe-conduct to attend the Council of Constance and to return. The honor of the empire was pledged for his security. Yet on the twenty-sixth day after the arrival of Huss, he was seized, in flagrant violation of the safe-conduct, carried before the pope and the cardinals, thrust into a filthy prison, and afterwards burned at the stake, without being allowed to speak in his own defense, simply because he denounced the iniquities of the papacy. This was done by order of the council, and the conscience of the emperor was pacified by the decree that “no faith is to be kept with heretics to the prejudice of the church.” This was the doctrine of the third Lateran Council, which affirmed that, “Oaths made against the interest and benefit of the church are not so much to be considered as oaths, but as prejudices.” *SITI October 22, 1885, page 633.30*

Is a fact that the “true character” of the papacy may be learned from a study of the sacred Scriptures. Its character is especially portrayed in *Daniel 7:21, 25; 2 Thessalonians 2:3, 4; Revelation 13:1-7, and 17:3-6*. The Scriptures, together with the *facts* of history, compel us to coincide with the declaration of Luther, that “the papacy is a general chase led by the Roman bishop [pope] to catch and destroy souls.” *SITI October 22, 1885, page 634.1*

In writing thus, we have not the slightest personal feeling against any Catholic, and we can readily believe that a large proportion of them are sincere in their devotion. That many of the clergy are honest, is shown by the fact that we frequently hear of priests who are abjuring the Catholic faith. We expect to see many more honest souls leave that communion. It is a fact that comparatively few Catholics are acquainted with the real character and history of their church. These things are kept from them. And so our attack is not on any individual Catholic, but on Roman Catholicism—“the mystery of iniquity”—the monster of organized deception, superstition, and crime. *SITI October 22, 1885, page 634.2*

We wish also to inform our correspondent that we have no apology to make for the perversions and curtailments of Scripture by

modern Protestants.*SITI October 22, 1885, page 634.3*

“Modern Protestant pulpits” are very different affairs from those of three hundred years ago. A great deal that is called Protestantism is not worthy of the name-it is so much like Catholicism. This is the great danger of the day. Professed Protestants, who laud the work of Huss, Jerome, Luther, and Knox, will call a man a bigot if he presumes to speak against the Catholic Church, forgetting that that church has the same character to-day that it had when Luther so boldly assailed it. A temporary loss of power is all the difference there is between the papacy now and the papacy then.*SITI October 22, 1885, page 634.4*

It is impossible for us to recount the evils of Romanism every time we speak of that communion, and therefore the reader will please take these few quotations, which might easily be multiplied a hundredfold, as evidence that we know whereof we speak when we warn people against the papacy. We do not design to use “mysterious sentences,” but we hope ever to have grace and courage enough to speak boldly against the enemy of all civil and religious liberty-Roman Catholicism-and against all that savors of it, even though it sails under the banner of Protestantism. E. J. W.*SITI October 22, 1885, page 634.5*

October 29, 1885

“The Fourth Kingdom” The Signs of the Times, 11, 41.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSONS FOR PACIFIC COAST—NOV. 14 AND 21

No Authorcode

The Fourth Kingdom

In order to catch up, so that the notes may be of service to Sabbath-school scholars in the East, it is necessary this week to furnish notes on lessons 9 in 10. This may be done without any break in the notes, since the subject begun in the ninth lesson,—The Fourth Kingdom,—is continued through the tenth.*SITI October 29, 1885, page 646.1*

The fourth kingdom is described in *Daniel 2, 7, and 8*. It will therefore be our work to quote these several descriptions, to show that they all apply to the same power, and to show beyond question the name of that power. The basis of the whole is found in the second chapter of Daniel. In that chapter, as already learned, four universal empires are symbolized by the four different metals of which the image was composed. The fourth division of the image was the legs of iron, and the feet and toes of mingled iron and clay. Of this division the prophet said: “And the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron: forasmuch as iron breaketh in pieces and subdueth all things; and as iron that breaketh all these, shall it break in pieces and bruise.” *Daniel 2:40.SITI October 29, 1885, page 646.2*

This fourth kingdom is the only one that is not somewhere in the prophecy directly named; but by the data given we may identify it as readily as though it were called by name. Thus: There are to be but four universal monarchies from the time of Daniel’s prophecy, since the fourth closes with the setting up of God’s everlasting kingdom,

which is to take the place of all others. See *Daniel 2:34, 35, 44, 45*. From *Daniel 2:37, 38* we learn that Babylon was the first of these universal monarchies. *Daniel 5* relates the history of the last night of Babylonian rule, and *verses 28, 30, 31* tell what power succeeded. *Ezra 1:2* shows that the Medo-Persian Empire, like its predecessor, was a universal dominion. In *Daniel 8:3-7, 20, 21*, we are plainly told that Grecia was to overthrow the Persian Empire, and fill its place; and history bears witness that such was the case. The Grecian Empire, especially under Alexander the Great, did “bear rule over all the earth.” *Daniel 2:39. SITI October 29, 1885, page 646.3*

Thus we have identified three of the four universal kingdoms that were to reach from the prophet’s time till the end of the world. Now if we can find any mention of the universal monarchy, other than Babylon, Persia, and Greece, we shall *know* that it is the fourth kingdom, the one represented by the legs of iron. This is as evident as it is that three from four leaves one. Now in *Luke 2:1* a universal dominion is brought to view; for we read: “And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Cæsar of Augustus, that *all the world* should be taxed.” But everybody recognizes Cæsar as a Roman name, and Cæsar Augustus is the first Roman emperor. Then since his dominion extended over all the world, it follows that Rome was the fourth universal empire, the one represented by the legs of iron in *Daniel 2:33. SITI October 29, 1885, page 646.4*

Profane history coincides with sacred history in declaring Rome to be universal. Says Gibbon:—*SITI October 29, 1885, page 646.5*

“A modern tyrant who would find no resistance either in his own breast or in his people, would soon experience a gentle restraint in the example of his equals, the dread of present censure, the advice of his allies, and the apprehension of his enemies. The object of his displeasure, escaping from the narrow limits of his dominions, would easily obtain in a happier climate a secure refuge, a new fortune adequate to his merits, the freedom of complaint, and, perhaps, the means of revenge. But the empire of the Romans *filled the world*; and when that empire fell into the hands of a single person, the world became a safe and dreary prison for his enemies.

The slave of imperial despotism, whether he was compelled to drag his gilded chain in Rome and the Senate, or to wear out a life of exile on the barren rock of Seriphus or the frozen banks of the Danube, expected his fate in silent despair. To resist was fatal, and it was impossible to fly. On every side he was encompassed with a vast extent of sea and land, which he could not hope to traverse without being discovered, seized, and restored to his irritated master. Beyond the frontiers his anxious gaze could discover nothing except the ocean, inhospitable desert, hostile tribes of barbarians of fierce manners and unknown language, or dependent kings, who would gladly purchase the emperor's protection by the sacrifice of an obnoxious fugitive. '*Wherever you are,*' said Cicero to the exiled Marcellus, '*remember that you are equally within the power of the conqueror.*'"-*Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, chap. 3, paragraph 37.*SITI October 29, 1885, page 646.6

The same historian, in another place, in recording the universal conquest of Rome, makes unmistakable reference to *Daniel 2:40*, in the following words:-*SITI October 29, 1885, page 646.7*

"The ambitious design of conquest, which might have been defeated by the seasonable conspiracy of mankind, was attempted and achieved, and the perpetual violation of justice was maintained, by the political virtues of prudence and courage. The arms of the republic sometimes vanquished in battle, always victorious in war, advanced with rapid strides to the Euphrates, the Danube, the Rhine, and the ocean; and the images of gold, or silver, or brass, that might serve to represent the nations and their kings, were successively broken by the *iron* monarchies of Rome."-*Decline and Fall, chap.38, par. 44.*SITI October 29, 1885, page 646.8

In the seventh of Daniel, four beasts are seen coming out of the sea. These beasts denote four kingdoms. *Verse 17*. These four kings are universal; for it is expressly said of the fourth: "Thus he said, The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth, which shall be diverse from all kingdoms, and shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and break it in pieces." *Daniel 7:23*. Then the four beasts must represent respectively Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome. The description of the fourth kingdom, as given in *verse 23*, tallies exactly with the character of

Rome as described by Gibbon. So we find that the “dreadful and terrible” beast of *Daniel 7*, is identical with the legs of iron of *Daniel 2*. *SITI October 29, 1885, page 646.9*

Again, in the eighth of Daniel we find the same succession of universal kingdoms referred to. The prophecy begins with the Medo-Persia, represented by the ram, and shows its conquest by Grecia, which was represented by the goat. The Great War between its eyes, represented the first king of Grecia as a universal monarchy, viz., Alexander the Great. When this horn was broken, four notable ones came up in its place (*Daniel 8:8*), indicating that at the death of the first king, Alexander, four kingdoms should “stand up out of the nation, but not in his power.” *Verse 22*. Alexander died B.C. 323, and the history of the kingdom after his death is just briefly summarized by Dr. Barnes in his notes of this passage: -*SITI October 29, 1885, page 646.10*

“Though the kingdom was not by him [Alexander] divided into four parts, yet, from the confusion and conflicts that arose, power was ultimately concentrated into four dynasties. At his death, his brother Aridaeus declared king in his stead, and Perdicas regent. But the unity of the Macedonian power was gone, and disorder and confusion, and a struggle for empire, immediately succeeded.... In 305 B.C. the successors of Alexander took the title kings, and in 301 B.C. there occurred the battle of Ipsus, in which Antigonos, who reigned in Asia Minor, was killed, and then followed in that year a formal division of Alexander’s empire between the four victorious princes, Ptolemy, Seleucus, Cassander, and Lysimachus. In the division of the empire, Seleucus Nicator obtained Syria, Babylonia, Media and Susiana, Armenia, a part of Cappadocia, Celicia, and his kingdom, in name, at least, extended from the Hellespont to the Indias. The kingdom of Lysimachus extended over a part of Thrace, Asia Minor, part of Cappadocia, and the countries within the limits of Mount Taurus. Cassander possessed Macedonia, Thessaly, and a part of Greece. Ptolemy obtained Egypt, Cyprus, and Cyrene, and ultimately Coele-Syria. Phenicia, Judea, and a part of Asia Minor and Thrace. Thus the dominions of Seleucus were in the West; those of Ptolemy in the South; and those of the Lysimachus in the North.” *SITI October 29, 1885, page 646.11*

The entire history of these four divisions of the Grecian Empire is given by Rollin under the head of “Alexander’s Successors,” thus showing that each one of the divisions, and all the kings of each division, are considered still forming a part of the goat,-Grecia,-and not as forming a kingdom which should take the place of Greece.*SITI October 29, 1885, page 646.12*

“And out of one of them [*i.e.*, one of the four horns of the goat], came forth a little horn, which waxed exceeding great, toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land.” *Daniel 8:9*. The power here brought to view is described in *verses 10-12 and 23-25*. Before noticing any points in this description, we pause to state that from what we have already learned, we know that this little horn symbolizes Rome. We know it by the same means by which we determined that the legs of iron symbolized Rome. Four universal monarchies cover the world’s entire history, from the time of the prophet until the coming of the Lord. These four kingdoms we have found to be Babylon, the Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome. The first three are named in the prophecy; the last one we determined by a mathematical demonstration. Well, in this prophesy we have Medo-Persia brought to view, with Greece succeeding it. These powers are respectively term “great” and “very great.” *Verses 4, 8*. Now immediately following Greece, we have a power represented by a little horn, which is said to wax “exceedingly great.” It must then have been more powerful than either Medo-Persia Greece, and consequently could not be less than universal. But if it was universal, it must have been Rome; for Rome was the only power, after Greece, which, as both sacred and profane history agree, was able to break in pieces and subdue all nations.*SITI October 29, 1885, page 646.13*

Lack of space prevents our noticing the further description of this little horn, and showing its exact fulfillment in the Roman Empire. These points will be noted next week, before commenting on the next lesson. E.J. W.*SITI October 29, 1885, page 646.14*

““From Adam to Moses”” The Signs of the Times, 11, 41.

E. J. Waggoner

A brother writes as follows:-*SITI October 29, 1885, page 649.1*

“Do you think that in the expression in *Romans 5:14*, ‘Death reigned from Adam to Moses,’ the apostle had reference to the resurrection of Moses; that the reign of death was there broken, as is inferred from *Jude 9*?”*SITI October 29, 1885, page 649.2*

ANS.-No; there is no hint of the resurrection of Moses in the fifth of Romans. We give, in brief, the following reasons for this statement:-*SITI October 29, 1885, page 649.3*

1. The subject of the resurrection is not under consideration. The subject of discourse is justification by faith in Christ. In order to show the importance of this, the apostle shows that all are under condemnation of death through transgression of the law. “By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men.” Wherever there is death it is an evidence of the existence of sin; and since “sin is not imputed when there is no law,” the fact that “death reigned from Adam to Moses,” shows that during all that time God’s law was known and transgressed. It was necessary to show the extent of the need, in order to show how greatly the grace of God abounded. In such an argument, to branch off upon the resurrection of Moses would be manifestly out of place.*SITI October 29, 1885, page 649.4*

2. The phrase “until the law,” indicates what time in the history of Moses is referred to. “From Adam to Moses,” then, simply means, from the creation to the giving of the law upon Sinai. Of course the text itself, speaking of sin, which is not imputed when there is no law, shows that the phrase “until the law,” does not mean that the law did not exist before. But if the time indicated in the expression, “Death ranged from Adam to Moses,” reaches only to the giving of the law upon Sinai, it certainly could have no reference to the resurrection of Moses, since he did not die till forty years later.*SITI October 29, 1885, page 649.5*

3. There can be no reference to the resurrection of Moses, since the fact that Moses died shows that death reigned over him as well as over anybody else. A subsequent resurrection would not alter the fact that death had extended its reign over him, anymore than the general resurrection would alter the fact that death has reigned

over all mankind. If the resurrection of Moses shows that death did not reign over him, then the final resurrection of all men will show that death never reigned over anybody. That which proves too much, proves nothing. *SITI October 29, 1885, page 649.6*

4. In order to have the expression of any force as indicating the breaking of the reign of death by the resurrection of Moses, it would be necessary to show that up to the time of Moses all men had died; but the case of Enoch entirely destroys that argument. The translation of Enoch was certainly more of a break in the reign of death than was the resurrection of Moses. But the fact is, there has not been a moment since the fall when death did not reign, although some, as Enoch and Elijah, and Moses and the saints at the crucifixion of Christ, have been rescued from its power, as pledges of the time when its reign will be forever broken. *SITI October 29, 1885, page 649.7*

The fact that “the dead know not anything,” but sleep, unconscious, in the grave (*Ecclesiastes 9:5; Psalm 146:3, 4; 115:17; 88:10-12; Job 10:18-22, etc.*), and that fifteen hundred years after his death Moses was seen by Peter, James, and John, is proof enough that Moses was raised from the dead. *Jude 9*, which speaks of the dispute between Michael (Christ) and the devil over the *body* of Moses, corroborates this fact. There is not the slightest doubt but that Moses was raised from the dead, but there is no more doubt that *Romans 5* contains no reference to such resurrection. E. J. W. *SITI October 29, 1885, page 649.8*

“Paul and the Revision Committee” The Signs of the Times, 11, 41.

E. J. Waggoner

In the eighth psalm, one of the most beautiful compositions ever written, occurs this passage, which has become familiar even to those not intimately acquainted with the Bible: “When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained; what is man, that thou art mindful of him? and the son of man, that thou visitest him? For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honour.” *Verses 3-5. SITI October 29, 1885, page 649.9*

In the New Version the *5th verse* reads thus: "For thou hast made him but lower than God, and crownest him with glory and honor." A religious journal, in noting some changes in familiar text, puts this text in a group of which it says: "The following changes have perhaps been necessary, but grate sadly against literary associations." For ourselves, we can say that the change grates sadly against Scriptural associations, and we do not believe it to be at all necessary. We give the following reason why we dare disagree with the learned Revision Committee:-*SITI October 29, 1885, page 649.10*

In the second chapter of Hebrews, the apostle, in showing how Christ, who had "by inheritance" a more excellent name than the angels, was made on a level with men, quotes the words of the psalmist concerning man, as follows: "But one in a certain place testified, saying, What is man, that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man, that thou visitest him? Thou madest him a little lower than the angels; thou crownedst him with glory and honor." *Hebrews 2:6, 7*. Here the Greek word is *angelos*, the word invariably rendered "angel." There is no question but that the apostle used the word *angeloi* (plural form) in quoting from *Psalms 8:5*, and the Revision Committee have agreed that it is correctly rendered "angels," since it is so rendered in the New Version. But if "angels" is the proper word to use in quoting from *Psalms 8:5*, and the authority of an inspired apostle ought certainly to settle that point, why should not the same word be used in the passage itself? By what authority did the revisers use the word "God" in rendering the Hebrew word which Paul translates "angels"? *SITI October 29, 1885, page 649.11*

It is true that the Hebrew word in *Psalms 8:5* is *eloheem*, a word that is usually used with reference to a deity, either the true God or a false god, and there is no other place in the Old Testament where it is rendered "angels;" and therefore the revisers doubtless thought that consistency required them to render it "God" in this instance. But we are certain that consistency would require instead that the text should agree with the same text as translated by the inspired writer of Hebrews. In other words, even though the lexicons knew nothing about such a rendering of *eloheem*, *Hebrews 2:7* would show that in one instance, at least, it undoubtedly refers to angels.

And the Revision Committee, in retaining the word “angels” in *Hebrews 2:7*, while they rejected it in *Psalms 8:5*, have convicted themselves of inconsistency. *SITI October 29, 1885, page 649.12*

Such renderings go a long ways toward making some people doubt whether the New Version is a decided improvement on the Old. At any rate, we do not feel inclined to use it to the exclusion of the Old Version. While we find it very valuable as a commentary, we regard it in that light, and cannot rely upon it with that confidence that we do upon the version commonly used. A translator of the Bible needs, far more than the commentator, to be acquainted with the entire Bible, and thoroughly imbued with its spirit. We very much doubt if it is possible for any body of men to agree upon a version of the Bible that will be superior to King James’s version. E. J. W. *SITI October 29, 1885, page 650.1*

November 5, 1885

“The Little Horn of *Daniel 7*” The Signs of the Times, 11, 42.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—NOV. 23

No Authorcode

The Little Horn of *Daniel 7*

Before making any comments on the “little horn” of *Daniel 7*, we wish to complete the notes on the “little horn” of *Daniel 8*, which was the subject of last week’s lesson. By reference to the notes of last week, it will be seen that we proved conclusively that the “little horn” of *Daniel 8* represents the Roman Empire. This proof cannot be repeated, but one or two additional proofs will be given. It will be remembered that the third kingdom-Grecia-represented by the goat with the notable horn, was divided into four parts after the death of Alexander, the four divisions being represented by the four horns which “came” after the great horn was broken. The prophet then introduces the fourth kingdom-Rome-as follows:-*SITI November 5, 1885, page 662.1*

“And out of one of them came forth a little horn, which waxed *exceeding great*, toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land.” *Daniel 8:9*. This seems to some to be an objection to calling this little horn Rome; for how, they ask, could Rome be said to come forth from one of the divisions of the Grecian Empire? In point of fact, this is no objection at all; but on careful consideration is just what we might expect; for if Grecia was a universal empire, which is affirmed by both sacred and profane history, then any power which should rise up against it, must naturally come forth from some part of it. That Alexander’s dominion was universal, extending even to Rome, is attested by the following statements:*SITI November 5, 1885, page 662.2*

“The Lucanians and Bruttians [inhabitants of Italy] are especially mentioned as having sent embassies to Alexander at Babylon.”
“‘The Tyrrhenians also,’ said Aristobulus and Ptolemaeus, ‘sent an embassy to the king to congratulate him upon his conquests.’”
“There is every reason to believe that among the Tyrrhenian ambassadors mentioned by Alexander’s historians, there were included ambassadors from Rome.... History may allow us to think that Alexander and a Roman ambassador did meet at Babylon; that the greatest man of the ancient world saw and spoke with a citizen of that great nation which was destined to succeed him in his appointed work, and to found a wider and still more enduring empire.”-*Arnold’s History of Rome, chap. 30, part. 1 and 2**SITI November 5, 1885, page 662.3*

But there is still more direct evidence to show the propriety of speaking of Rome as coming out of one of the divisions of the Grecian Empire. We quote and abridge from Prideaux, who relates the history in a very entertaining manner. First, however, we will state that the four divisions represented by the four horns, were Macedon, Thrace, Syria, and Egypt. In the year 168 B.C., Antiochus Ephiphanes, then king of the Syrian division, determined to make himself master of Egypt, which was then governed by his nephew and niece, who were very strong, and incapable of successful resistance. Says Prideaux:-*SITI November 5, 1885, page 662.4*

“This he most certainly would have accomplished, but that he met a Roman embassy in his way, which put a stop to his further progress, and totally dashed all the designs which he had been so long carrying on for the making of himself master of that country.”-*Connexion, Vol. 2, Book 3, “An. 168, Ptol. Philometer 13.”SITI November 5, 1885, page 662.5*

The embassy was one which the Roman Senate had sent in response to the request of the young Egyptian monarch for assistance against Antiochus. The reader will not fail to note that only three ambassadors, and not an army, were sent by the Romans to command Antiochus to desist from his intended war on Egypt. These ambassadors met Antiochus when he was only four miles from Alexandria, when he was on his way to be besiege that city. The chief ambassador was Popilius, with whom Antiochus had

been intimate while he was in Rome as a hostage. On seeing Popillius, Antiochus reached for his hand to embrace him as an old friend. "But Popillius, refusing the complement, told him that the public interest of his country must take the place of private friendship; that he must first know whether he were a friend or an enemy to the Roman State, before he could own him as a friend to himself; and then delivered in his hands the tables in which were written the decree of the Senate, which they came to communicate to him, and required him to read it and forthwith give him his answer thereto. Antiochus, having read the decree, told Popillius he would consult with his friends about it, and speedily give him the answer they should advise; but Popillius, insisting on an immediate answer, forthwith drew a circle round him [Antiochus] in the sand, with the staff which he had in his hand, and required him to give his answer before he stirred out of that circle; at which strange and peremptory way of proceeding, Antiochus, being startled, after a little hesitation, yielded to it, and told the ambassador that he would obey the command of the Senate; whereupon Popillius, accepting his embraces, acted thenceforth according to his former friendship with him." *SITI November 5, 1885, page 662.6*

But the point of all this is found in the next two sentences of Prideaux. Says he: "That which made him [i.e., Popillius] so bold as to act with him after this peremptory manner, and the other so tame as to yield thus patiently to it, was the news which they had a little before received of the great victory of the Romans, which they had gotten over Perseus, king of Macedonia. For Paulus Æmilius, having now vanquished that king, and thereby added Macedonia to the Roman Empire, the name of the Romans after this carried that weight with it as carried a terror in all the neighboring nations; so that none of them after this cared to dispute their commands, but were glad on any terms to maintain peace, and cultivate a friendship with them." *SITI November 5, 1885, page 662.7*

Now since it was the conquest of Macedon which gave Rome its prestige among the nations, and made it virtually a universal empire, having the power to dictate to other kingdoms, and to stop their projects by a single word, it is evidently very proper to speak of it as "coming out" of one of the horns of goat, viz., the Macedonian horn. The historian, in describing the rise of the Roman Empire,

could not well employ a more fitting expression than that used by the prophet, 370 years before the occurrence. The quotation given above shows the immense superiority of the Romans over Antiochus Epiphanes, and thus of itself effectually demolishes the theory held by some that that pusillanimous king was the “exceeding great” power represented by the little horn. *SITI November 5, 1885, page 662.8*

Now we must turn our attention to the present lesson, “The little Horn of *Daniel 7*.” The student must be careful not to confound this little horn with that of *Daniel 8*. The little horn of *Daniel 8* represents the Roman Empire as a whole; the little horn of *Daniel 7* represents the Roman Empire only under one phase, the whole empire being represented by the fourth beast, of which the little horn was only a part. We quote the description of the beast and of the little horn, as given by the prophet. *SITI November 5, 1885, page 662.9*

“After this I saw in the night visions, and behold a fourth beast, dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly; and it had great iron teeth: it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it; and it was diverse from all the beasts that were before it; and it had ten horns. I considered the horns, and, behold, there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots: and, behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of man, and a mouth speaking great things.” *Daniel 7:7, 8. SITI November 5, 1885, page 662.10*

When Daniel was troubled over the explanation of this vision, an angel gave him the interpretation, and in beginning said: “These great beasts, which are four, are four kings, which shall arise out of the earth. But the saints of the most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever.” *Daniel 7:17, 18*. So the beasts represented the four universal kingdoms that cover the history of the world till the coming of the Lord. These four kingdoms have already been named, and therefore we well know that the fourth beast represents the Roman Empire. See the further description in *Daniel 7:23. SITI November 5, 1885, page 662.11*

But Daniel was not satisfied with the first answer given by the angel.

From his connection with Nebuchadnezzar's dream he must have known the main features of these four kingdoms; but there were some particulars upon which he desired more light. "Then I would know the truth of the fourth beast [answered again *verse 23*].... and of the ten horns that were in his head, and of the other which came up, and before whom three fell; even of that horn that had eyes, and a mouth that spake very great things, whose look was more stout than his fellows." *Daniel 7:19, 20*. The answer to this request was given as follows:-*SITI November 5, 1885, page 662.12*

"Thus he said, The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth.... and the ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings that shall arise: and another shall rise after them; and he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings." *Daniel 7:23, 24*. The fourth beast was the fourth kingdom-Rome-and the ten horns, it is plainly stated, "are ten kingdoms that shall arise," that is, ten parts into which the Roman Empire should be divided. This division is mentioned in *Daniel 2:41*. It was effected by the incursions of the barbarous tribes which dismembered the Roman Empire in the fourth and fifth centuries, so graphically described by Gibbon. The division was complete, and the undivided empire of Western Rome had ceased to exist, before the close of the fifth century B.C.*SITI November 5, 1885, page 662.13*

After the division of Rome into ten parts another power was to arise, diverse from the others, and having the characteristics mentioned in *Daniel 7:8, 20, 21, 25*. These characteristics are met in the papacy, and in no other power. It uprooted three powers to make room for itself, and as if to identify the papacy as the power here referred to, the pope's tiara is a triple crown; such a crown is worn by no other ruler.*SITI November 5, 1885, page 662.14*

"And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the most High, and think to change times and laws; and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time." *Daniel 7:25*. If we find that these three specifications apply to the papacy, then it will be useless to look further for an application for the little horn. We can give to each specification only a brief notice.*SITI November 5, 1885, page 662.15*

1. "He shall speak great words against the Most High." It is a notorious fact that the pope is styled the "Vicar of the Son of God," indicating that he fills the office of Christ. Paul, speaking of the papacy, which he calls the "man of sin" (*2 Thessalonians 2:3, 4*), says that he "exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped." This is parallel to *Daniel 7:25*. It is fulfilled in the pope's claim to have power to grant indulgences, a thing which God himself has never promised to do. Further, it is fulfilled in the papal dogma of infallibility. This dogma was ratified by the Council of 1870, and the following is a portion of the decree:-*SITI November 5, 1885, page 662.16*

"And since by the divine right of apostolic primacy the Roman pontiff is placed over the universal church, we further teach and declare that he is the *supreme judge of the faithful*, and that in all causes the decision of which belongs to the church, recourse may be had to his tribunal, and that none may re-open the judgment of the apostolic, than whose authority *there is no greater*, nor can any lawfully review its judgment."-*The Vatican Decrees, by Dr. Philip Schaff*. Although this dogma was ratified in 1870, it has been held for centuries, as is shown by the following monstrous assertion in one of the Roman decretals:-*SITI November 5, 1885, page 663.1*

"If the pope should become neglectful of his own salvation, and of that of other men, and so lost to all good that he draw down with himself innumerable people by heaps into hell, and plunge them with himself into eternal damnation, yet no mortal man may presume to reprehend him, for as much as he is judged of all, and to be judged of no one."-*Quoted by Wiley, History of Protestantism, Book 4, chap. 10. SITI November 5, 1885, page 663.2*

2. "And shall wear out the saints of the Most High." When we come to this particular, the evidence is overwhelming. Both time and language would fail to do justice to the matter. Prominent among papal atrocities is the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day. On the 24th of August, 1572, was begun in Paris one of the most horrible cold-blooded massacres that history records,-that of the Huguenots. The king himself, Charles IX., took part in it, shooting down many of those who were attempting to escape the fury of his soldiers. The number slain throughout France on this occasion is placed by the

best authorities at 70,000. To show Rome's connection with the massacre, we quote:-*SITI November 5, 1885, page 663.3*

"At Rome, when the news arrived, the joy was boundless. The messenger who carried the dispatch was rewarded like one who brings tidings of some great victory, and the triumph that followed was such as old Pagan Rome might have been proud to celebrate.... Through the streets of the Eternal City swept, in the full blaze a pontifical pomp, Gregory and his attendant train of cardinals, bishops, and monks, to the church of St. Mark, there to offer up prayers and thanksgivings to the God of Heaven for his great blessing to the See of Rome and the Roman Catholic Church.... On the following day the pontiff went in procession to the church of Minerva, where, after mass, a jubilee was published to all Christendom, 'that they might thank God for the slaughter of the enemies of the church lately executed in France.'" -*History of Protestantism, Book 17, chap.16, par. 15. SITI November 5, 1885, page 663.4*

But the saints were to be *worn out*. This implies more than outright slaughter. We quote one paragraph from the account of the imprisonment of the Waldenses, when, at the command of Louis XIV., who was the obedient servant of the pope, they had been driven from their valleys:-*SITI November 5, 1885, page 663.5*

"We know not if ever before an entire nation were in prison at once. Yet now it was so. All of the Waldensian race that remained from the sword of the executioners were immured in the dungeons of Piedmont.... And how were they treated in prison? As the African slave was treated on the 'middle passage.' They had a sufficiency of neither food nor clothing. The bread dealt out to them was fetid. They had putrid water to drink. They were exposed to the sun by day, and to the cold at night. They were compelled to sleep on the bare pavement, or on straw so full of vermin that the stone floor was preferable. Disease broke out in these horrible abodes, and the mortality was fearful. 'When they entered these dungeons,' says Henri Arnaud, 'they counted 14,000 healthy mountaineers, but when, at the intercession of the Swiss deputies, their prisons were opened, 3,000 skeletons only crawled out.'" -*Hist. Protestantism, Book 16, chap. 13, par. 18. SITI November 5, 1885, page 663.6*

In the above instance, we see how an entire nation was literally worn out, yet we have scarcely more than hinted at the atrocities visited upon the innocent Waldenses. In the following brief extract from the account of the martyrdom of Cranmer, we see a sample of how Rome proceeded to “wear out” individuals:-*SITI November 5, 1885, page 663.7*

“The fire was lighted, and then withdrawn, and lighted again, so as to consume him piecemeal. His scorch and half-burned body was raised on the pikes of the halberdiers, and tossed from one to the other to all the extent of his chain would allow; the martyr, says the martyrologist, ‘lifting such hands as he had, and his finger ends flaming with fire, cried unto the people in these words, “None but Christ, none but Christ,” and so being let down again from their halberds, he fell into the fire, and gave up his life.’”-*Wiley, Book 23, chap. 10.SITI November 5, 1885, page 663.8*

Certainly more is not needed to identify papal Rome as the little horn that was to “wear out the saints of the Most High.” Rome has more than met the demands of the prophecy. And the one who reads the history from which these extracts are taken, must of necessity exclaim, Surely the Roman Catholic power is the woman whom the seer of Patmos saw “drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus.” *Revelation 17:6*. Happy would it be for the saints of God if they could be assured that she is sated with blood. But such assurance cannot be given; for says the prophet, “I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them; until the Ancient of days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High; and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom.” *Daniel 7:21, 22*. E. J. W.*SITI November 5, 1885, page 663.9*

“What Is the Use?” The Signs of the Times, 11, 42.

E. J. Waggoner

This is called a practical age. Men always ask before engaging in any business, Will it pay? And this is correct. It is useless to work to no profit, and so we have Scripture warrant for counting the cost before beginning any enterprise. But men are not always wise in

their estimates. Sometimes, indeed in the majority of instances, the results will showed that the entire cost has not been counted. Some factor has been omitted, or else the individual has not looked far enough ahead. We might cite two instances:-*SITI November 5, 1885, page 664.1*

It is generally considered a prudent thing for men to amass wealth. "Men will praise thee, when thou doest well to thyself." *Psalm 49:18*. Indeed, so fixed is the idea that to get rich is the one thing essential, that few, before praising the prosperous men, stop to inquire by what means he obtained his wealth. But according to the Bible standard, the gathering of great wealth may be the most foolish thing a man can do.*SITI November 5, 1885, page 664.2*

The wise man says: "He that by usury and unjust gain increaseth his substance, he shall gather it for him that will pity the poor." *Proverbs 28:8*. If people knew that men who are toiling and planning night and day in order to accumulate property, were simply working for someone else, and that they themselves should enjoy none of their savings, they would say, "How foolish to work so hard for nothing." Well, that is just what the Bible says. "He that getteth riches, and not by right, shall leave them in the midst of his day, and at his end shall be a fool." *Jeremiah 17:11*. How many foolish people there are, who by the world are counted wise.*SITI November 5, 1885, page 664.3*

All this exposes another shortsighted calculation that is very common, viz., that it is safe to do anything which is done by the majority of people. Precedent is a thing that has great weight, both in court and public opinion, oftentimes to the exclusion of justice. But numbers can never make wrong right, nor will the Lord remit the punishment due for the commission of crime, because very many are engaged in it. "Though hand show in hand, the wicked shall not be unpunished." *Proverbs 11:21*. And the truth of this statement has often been demonstrated. In the days of Noah, "the earth was filled with violence," because "every imagination of the thought" of man's heart "was only evil continually." *Genesis 6:5, 11*. Only Noah was found righteous. Yet the Lord preserved Noah, and destroyed all the wicked, "bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly." 2 *Peter 2:5*.*SITI November 5, 1885, page 664.4*

In the days of Lot, “the men of Sodom were wicked and sinners before the Lord exceedingly.” *Genesis 13:13*. In all that city, careful search was made (*Genesis 18:23-33; 19:12-14*), and, besides Lot, not a righteous man was found. But the Lord had no respect to numbers, “and turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes condemned them with an overthrow, *making them an ensample unto those that after should live ungodly.*” 2 *Peter 2:6*. *SITI November 5, 1885, page 664.5*

There was also a time when a single man, Elijah, stood out against the whole kingdom of Israel. He was not content with simply disagreeing with the majority, but he was earnest in reproving both monarch and subject. Baal-worship was popular, and was, moreover, the State religion. How presumptuous that one man attempt to teach the priests and rulers! How was it possible that he alone of all the people should have the truth? And even allowing his claims, what headway could one man hope to make against a nation? What was the use of his engaging in such an unprofitable task? Thus, the doubt, many reasoned at that time. But God vindicated the faithfulness of his servant. The prophets of Baal were slain; the wicked king and queen had the death of a dog; the apostate nation was carried into captivity; and he Elijah, who was not afraid to engage in an unpopular and seemingly unprofitable work, was taken to heaven in a chariot of fire. Who will now say that his work was to no profit? Not one. *SITI November 5, 1885, page 664.6*

But why is it that men can now approve Elijah’s course? Simply because the sins which he particularly denounced are not now popular. For proof of this assertion, we quote from the *Friend*, a religious journal published at Honolulu, H. I. It says: *SITI November 5, 1885, page 664.7*

“We have for a year or more had a couple of good brethren who among us, who have been devoting their time and strength, and the means of the organization that sent them, to the task of disseminating the idea that Saturday instead of Sunday should be observed as the day holy until Lord. We have often wished that the two brethren might see their way clear to engage in a worthier and more promising enterprise. One of them, Brother Scott, we think

has gone back to whence he came, and we wish him well. The other brother still tarries among us, and we would not have him depart; but we hope in his behalf for more useful employment.”*SITI November 5, 1885, page 664.8*

And then it quotes as follows from an exchange, concerning those were working in behalf of the Lord’s Sabbath:-*SITI November 5, 1885, page 664.9*

“We are sorry to see such a waste of time and pain. If the past shows anything, it shows that the vast majority of Christendom always has been, and it is now, firmly persuaded that the first day of the week is the day of rest by divine appointment. Can this judgment be reversed? Is there the remotest possibility that it ever will be? It seems to us that there can be but one answer to these questions. If so, then all the good intentions and conscientious convictions of our brethren do not hinder their efforts from being thrown away. Besides, there is the injurious effect of turning men’s thoughts away from the due observance of the day to the very subordinate question of its numerical designation.”*SITI November 5, 1885, page 664.10*

Not one hint of a question do we find in the above, as to whether those who educate the observance of the seventh day are really in the right, but only the consideration of popularity. “The vast majority of Christendom always has been, and it is now, firmly persuaded that the first day of the week is the day of rest.” “And since there is no probability that this verdict will ever be reversed, what is the use of trying to show its fallacy?” So the people might have talked in the days of Noah. “We are fully persuaded that the course which to us seems good is right, and you might as well quit your preaching. Better come and join us.”*SITI November 5, 1885, page 664.11*

Likewise when Lot went out to warn the inhabitants of Sodom, “he seemed as one that mocked.” No doubt he was called an old fool for his pains. And in both of these cases it was found that there was not any possibility of changing the universal verdict. Will the *Friend* say that they ought to have ceased preaching? What does the Lord say?*SITI November 5, 1885, page 664.12*

“Cry aloud, spare not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and show my

people there transgression, and the house of Jacob their sins.” *Isaiah 58:1*. “Son of man, I send thee to the children of Israel, to a rebellious nation that hath rebelled against me; they and their fathers have transgressed against me, even unto this very day.... And thou shalt speak by words unto them, whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear; for they are most of rebellious.” *Ezekiel 2:3-7*. *SITI November 5, 1885, page 664.13*

The question to be asked, then, is not, “Is the prevailing sentiment favorable to my message?” or, “Is there any hope of changing the general opinion?” but, “What is truth?” As a matter of fact, the majority of people have never been in the right, in spite of all efforts to lead them in the right way, and there is indeed no hope that they ever will be. Let us cite two authorities. *SITI November 5, 1885, page 664.14*

Luther, as a reformer, was very much like Elijah. In reality he was more alone than was the prophet. But the strongest arguments brought against his work was that the pope, bishops, divines, counsels, and universities were against him, and that he could not hope to convince them that they were in error. The majority never were convinced, but Luther replied as follows: *-SITI November 5, 1885, page 664.15*

“Moses was alone when the Israelites were led out of Egypt; Elijah was alone in the time of King Ahab; Ezekiel was alone at Babylon. God has ever chosen for his prophet either the high priest, or any other person of exalted rank; he has generally chosen men of a mean and low condition,-in the instance of Amos, even a simple shepherd. The saints in every age have been called upon to rebuke the great of this world,-kings and princes, priests and scholars,-and to fulfill the office at the peril of their lives.... I say not that I am a prophet; but I say that they have the more reason to fear *because* I am alone, and they are many. Of this I am sure, that the word of God is with me, and that it is not with them.” *SITI November 5, 1885, page 664.16*

“But it is further objected that men high in station pursued me with their censures. What then! Do not the Scriptures clearly show... That the majority has always been on the side of falsehood, and

that the minority only on the side of truth? It is the fate of truth to occasion an outcry.”-*D’Aubigne’s Hist. Reformation, Part 1, Book 7, par. 168, 173.*SITI November 5, 1885, page 664.17

The second authority, we have only to refer to the overwhelming wickedness in the times of Noah and Lot, and then read these words of Christ, which brings the matter home to our own day:-*SITI November 5, 1885, page 664.18*

“And as it was in the days of Noe, so shall it be also in the days of the Son of man. They did eat, they drank, they married wives, they were given in marriage, until the day that Noe entered into the ark, and the flood came, and destroyed them all. Likewise also as it was in the days of Lot; they did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded; but the same day that Lot went out of Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all. Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed.” *Luke 17:26-30.*SITI November 5, 1885, page 664.19

These illustrations are sufficient to show us that instead of appealing to common custom for proof of the correctness of any practice, that very fact ought to cause us to doubt. “The customs of the people are vain.” *Jeremiah 10:3.* And it will not do to say that, in the instances mentioned, those who were in the majority, and wrong, were heathen, while, in the matter of Sunday observance, the majority are Christians. In Elijah’s time it was the house of Israel-the church-that had taken Baal in preference to Jehovah. Ezekiel was sent with his warnings to the church of God; and in order that he might perform his thankless task, it was necessary that his face should be made “harder than flint.” Moreover, he was plainly told that the house of Israel would not listen to him. *Ezekiel 3:4-9.* Isaiah was commanded to show God’s people their transgression. John the Baptist lifted up his voice in the wilderness against the sins of the very leaders of the church. And it was solely on account of the corruption of the church that Luther began to preach the reformation. Since our reverence for God is measured only by our obedience, and not by our profession, all those who persist in violating any of God’s commandments are termed heathen. Throughout the Bible, the judgments of God are pronounced only against the heathen; and many who say, “Lord,

Lord,” will receive those judgments. So in this matter, if it can be shown that God has commanded us to keep the seventh day of the week, those who work to that end are engaged in a profitable business, even though the professed church will not hear. Those who do his commandments shall have right to the tree of life.*SITI November 5, 1885, page 664.20*

Next week we shall continue this subject, and show that the “numerical designation” of the day is not a “subordinate question,” and that whatever “injurious effects” may follow the preaching of truth, no blame can be attached to the few who thus labor against the majority. E. J. W.*SITI November 5, 1885, page 664.21*

“The Best Argument for Sunday” The Signs of the Times, 11, 42.

E. J. Waggoner

From the *Review* of October 27th, we learned that Sabbath-keepers in Arkansas are being put to serious trouble on account of their faith. Formerly there was provision made in the Sunday law of that State, so that those who conscientiously observed the seventh day of the week were not liable to arrest for working on the first day of the week. Last spring, however, this provision was repealed, and now all who do any work on Sunday are liable to heavy fines and imprisonment.*SITI November 5, 1885, page 665.1*

As a natural consequence of the law as it exists at present, quite a number of Sabbath-keepers have been arrested, and Elder Wood, who is laboring there and knows the state of feeling, thinks that there will be scores of arrests before the holidays. The brethren in Arkansas are poor, and can ill afford the expense and loss of time incident to court proceedings, even should they not be convicted; any persons wishing to aid them in their time of need can forward money for that purpose to F. N. Elmore, Springdale, Ark., and it will be thankfully received and properly applied.*SITI November 5, 1885, page 665.2*

The leaders of the so-called National Reform party have been constant in their assurances that no harm was intended by them to the conscientious observers of the seventh day. They have often

seemed to feel grieved and indignant because we have said that persecution would be the necessary result of their efforts to enforce Sunday observance. But, in spite of their pacific assurance, it has happened that, at every time the law would allow, Seventh-day Adventists have been promptly indicted for working on Sunday. If this is not a persecution because of religious convictions, then the popes of Rome never conducted such persecution.*SITI November 5, 1885, page 665.3*

None of our brethren need be surprised when such persecution comes. For years we have been suspecting it, knowing that it would come, because the “sure word of prophecy” plainly said that it would. The fulfillment of this prophecy is only a warning that the end is near, and an admonition to us to redouble our diligence. Here in California we have had an opportunity to see how quickly the spirit of persecution becomes rampant as soon as there is the slightest prospect of enforcing a Sunday law. And we shall watch with prayerful interest the proceedings in Arkansas. Whatever the immediate result, we are certain that God will make the wrath of man to praise him. E. J. W.*SITI November 5, 1885, page 665.4*

“Where Shall the Line Be Drawn” The Signs of the Times, 11, 42.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Weekly*, after making a statement that polygamy is not the only evil of Mormonism, says:-*SITI November 5, 1885, page 665.5*

“Its unrepblican hierarchy, that exalts the church above the Government, and demands unconditional obedience to its requirements, whatever may be the law of the land, makes it a dangerous institution in a country where the ballot box should be free from each ecclesiastical domination.”*SITI November 5, 1885, page 665.6*

With the truth contained in the above quotation, there is also a very popular error. It is a truth that cannot be too often repeated at the present day, that the ballot box should be free from ecclesiastical domination. We say that this truth cannot be too often repeated at

the present day, because there is not an influential and rapidly increasing party (not Mormons) whose great aim is to have the State legislate on matters pertaining to religion; or, in other words, to place the ballot box under the control of the church. When this state of things shall be brought about, the liberties of American people will be at an end. We protest, therefore, against the ecclesiastical domination in political affairs, whether it be by Mormons or by Christians; with either class the results would be the same, for no matter how pure a church may be, if it has civil power it will persecute just as quickly as will the corrupt church. So Mormon domination of the ballot box is to be objected to, not simply because it is Mormon domination, but because it is ecclesiastical domination.*SITI November 5, 1885, page 665.7*

The error in the quotation is in supposing that it is wrong in principle to obey the requirements of the church, "whatever may be the law of the *land*." We are no apologists for the Mormonism, but we say that this principle is not the one at issue. The question for individuals to settle is, Are the teachings of the church in strict harmony with the Bible, making unperverted Bible truth the sole standard? If fair and candid investigation shows that these teachings are in perfect accord with the Bible, then he should obey them, whatever may be the law of the land. "The powers that be are ordained of God." Then certainly they have no right to contravene the laws of God.*SITI November 5, 1885, page 665.8*

As a matter of fact, the Mormons are guilty of a sin, not against God alone, but against man as well. Murder, adultery, and theft are sins which destroy the well-being of society. If these things were allowed to be practiced with impunity, human governments, which God has ordained, would be overthrown. Therefore they must not be tolerated. On this ground, and this alone, the pet abomination of the Mormons should be suppressed by the Government. But a practice which is in strict accord with God's word, will not be detrimental to society; and against such a practice the Government has no right to enact a law; if it should, the people would be in duty bound to break that law.*SITI November 5, 1885, page 665.9*

No one need be confused over this matter. The Christian's duty is plain: "We ought to obey God rather than men" (*Acts 5:29*); and if

people would always remember this, and live accordingly, they would never make laws to suit their own inclinations or propensities, and try to palm them off on the people as the laws of God. E. J. W.*SITI November 5, 1885, page 665.10*

November 12, 1885

“The 1260 Days” The Signs of the Times, 11, 43.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—DEC. 5

No Authorcode

The 1260 Days

Our lesson this week is confined to the last clause of *Daniel 7:25*: “And they shall be given into his hands until a time and time and the dividing of time.” The “they” of course refers to the “saints of the Most High” and the “time and times and the dividing of time,” then, indicates the period of papal supremacy; for we have already seen that the little horn symbolizes the Roman Catholic power. *SITI November 12, 1885, page 678.1*

In the first place we may notice that in the Douay Bible, as well as in the Revised Version, “time and times and the dividing of times,” is rendered, “time, and times, and *half* a time.” We have no need to conjecture what this means, for the Bible is its own interpreter. In *Revelation 12:14* we find the same period of time mentioned: “And to the woman were given two wings of a great eagle, that she might fly into the wilderness, into her place, where she is nourished for a time, and times, and half a time, from the face of the serpent.” Now in *verse 6* of the same chapter the same event is brought to view in these words: “And the woman fled into the wilderness, where she hath a place prepared of God, that they should feed her there a thousand two hundred and threescore days.” From these two verses we learn that “a time, and times, and half a time” is only another expression for twelve hundred and sixty days. Then the little horn of *Daniel 7* was to have supremacy for twelve hundred and sixty days. *SITI November 12, 1885, page 678.2*

But the question now arises, "Is it possible that only twelve hundred and sixty days, three years and a half, covers the whole time which the prophecy allows to the papacy?" We answer, No; and the explanation is simple. The prophecy is symbolic; four mighty empires are represented by beasts; the Roman Catholic power is represented by a little horn of one of the beasts. It is obvious, then, that the prophecy would not be consistent if it should express the duration of those powers in literal years. The time would be out of proportion to the nature of the symbol representing the power. Therefore it is evident that the time must also be symbolic. We inquire, then, What is the standard of time when used in symbolic prophecy? In *Ezekiel 4:4-6* we read the answer:-*SITI November 12, 1885, page 678.3*

"Lie thou also upon thy left side, and lay the iniquity of the house of Israel upon it; according to the number of the days that thou shalt lie upon it thou shalt bear their iniquity. For I have laid upon thee the years of their iniquity, according to the number of the days, three hundred and ninety days; so shalt thou bear the iniquity of the house of Israel. And when thou hast accomplished them, lie again on thy right side, and thou shalt bear the iniquity of the house of Judah forty days; *I have appointed thee each day for a year.*"*SITI November 12, 1885, page 678.4*

The next question to be settled is, When does this period of time begin and end? There are several dates given by various authors to mark the rise of papal supremacy, but 538 A.D. seems to be the one that has the only just claim to consideration. The prophet in describing the rise of the little horn, says "He shall subdue three kings." *Daniel 7:24*. This is in explanation of the fact that three horns were to be plucked up before it. Of course the only powers that would be rooted up to do make room for the Catholic power would be those were all opposed to it. Now long before 538 A.D., paganism, as a State religion in the Roman Empire, was dead. Since the time of Constantine, and had been nominally Christian. The barbarous tribes by which the empire was divided into the ten parts, also embraced the Christianity of the empire. Says D'Aubigne:-*SITI November 12, 1885, page 678.5*

"Already the forests of the North poured forth the most effectual

promoters of the papal power. The barbarians who had invaded the West and settled themselves therein,-but recently converted to Christianity,-ignorant of the spiritual character of the church, and feeling the want of an external pomp of religion, prostrated themselves in a half savage and a half heathen state of mind at the feet of their chief priest Rome.”-*Hist. Reformation, Book 1, chap. 1, part. 31.**SITI November 12, 1885, page 678.6*

But not all of these tribes were favorable to the pretensions of the bishops of Rome. Some of them, especially the Heruli, the Vandals, and the Ostrogoths, were Arian in faith. The contest between the Catholics and Arians was bitter and unrelenting, and so long as these powers held Italy and the adjacent country, no Catholic bishop could rule in Rome. In the year 494 A.D., the power of the Heruli was annihilated by the death of one Odoacer. From that time it is impossible to trace them in history. In 534 the Vandals were conquered by Belisarius, the general of Justinian; and in 538 A.D., Rome, which until that time had been in possession of the Arian Ostrogoths, was occupied by the Roman army, and the Catholic religion was established. These conquests are described in detail in the 39th and 41st chapters of Gibbon.*SITI November 12, 1885, page 678.7*

When these Arian powers were overthrown (A.D. 538), previous imperial decrees concerning the bishop of Rome could go into effect. Speaking of the way in which the fallen bishop gradually usurped power over other churches, D'Aubigne says:-*SITI November 12, 1885, page 678.8*

“To silence the cries of the churches, Rome found new allies. Princes who in those troublesome times often found their thrones tottering, offered their adherence to the church in exchange for her support. They yielded to her spiritual authority, on condition of her paying them with secular dominion. They left her to deal at will with the *souls* of men, provided only she would deliver them from their enemies. The power of the hierarchy in the ascending scale, and of the imperial power which was declining, leaned thus one toward another, and so accelerated the twofold destiny. *SITI November 12, 1885, page 678.9*

“Rome could not lose by this. An edict of one Theodosius II. and of Valentinian III. proclaimed the bishop of Rome ‘ruler of all the churches.’ Justinian issued a similar decree. These decrees did not contain all that the popes pretended to see in them. But in those times of ignorance it was easy for them to gain reception for that interpretation which was most favorable to themselves.”-*Hist. Ref., Book 1, chap. 1, par. 29, 30.**SITI November 12, 1885, page 678.10*

To show plainly the object of these wars against the Arian powers, and what was gained by them, we make two brief quotations from Gibbon. After having rehearsed the defeat of the Vandals and the capture of Carthage by the Romans, the historian speaks as follows concerning Justinian:-*SITI November 12, 1885, page 678.11*

“He received the messengers of victory at the time when he was preparing to publish the pandects of the Roman law; and the devout or jealous emperor celebrated the divine goodness, and confessed in silence the merit of his successful general. Impatient to abolish the temporal and spiritual tyranny of the Vandals, he proceeded without delay to the full establishment of the Catholic church. Her jurisdiction, wealth, and immunities, perhaps the most essential part of the episcopal religion, were restored and amplified with a liberal hand; the Arian worship was suppressed, the Donatist meetings were proscribed; and the Synod of Carthage, by the voice of two hundred and seventeen bishops, applauded the just measure of pious retaliation.”-*Decline and Fall, chap. 41, par. 11.**SITI November 12, 1885, page 678.12*

The victory of Belisarius over the Ostrogoths (A.D. 538) is thus described:-*SITI November 12, 1885, page 678.13*

“The Goths consented to retreat in the presence of a victorious enemy; to delay till the next spring the operations of offensive war; to summon their scattered forces; to relinquish their distant possessions, and to trust even Rome itself to the faith of its inhabitants. Leuderis, an aged warrior, was left in the capital with four thousand soldiers; a feeble garrison, which might have seconded the zeal, though it was incapable of opposing the wishes, of the Romans. But a momentary enthusiasm of religion and patriotism was kindled in their minds. They furiously exclaimed that

the apostolic throne should no longer be profaned by the triumph or toleration of Arianism; that the tombs of the Cæsars should no longer be trampled by the savages of the North; and without reflecting that Italy must sink into a province of Constantinople, they fondly hailed the restoration of a Roman emperor as a new era of freedom and prosperity. The deputies of the pope and clergy, of the senate and people, invited the lieutenant of Justinian to accept their voluntary allegiance, and to enter the city, whose gates would be thrown open for his reception.... The first days, which coincided with the old Saturnalia, were devoted to mutual congratulation and the public joy, and the Catholics prepared to celebrate, without a rival, the approaching festival of the nativity of Christ.”-*Decline and Fall*, chap. 41, par. 22, 23.*SITI November 12, 1885, page 678.14*

These quotations show most conclusively that in A.D. 538 the bishop of Rome did become literally “the pope,” *i.e.*, the father, or head and ruler, of the churches. The last opposing horn had then been plucked up, and the papacy was free to enter upon that career of ecclesiastical tyranny which it had long been preparing for. And since this career was to continue 1260 years, it is evident that it must have been stopped in the year 1798 A.D. Let us see if at that time anything happened to justify this conclusion. From “Chambers’ Cyclopaedia,” art. “Pius,” we quote:-*SITI November 12, 1885, page 678.15*

“At length the [French] Directory ordered the invasion of Rome; Berthier entered the city February 10, 1798, took possession of the castle of St. Angelo. Pius [VI.] was called on to renounce his temporal sovereignty, and on his refusal, was seized, February 20, and carried away to Siena, afterwards to the celebrated Certosa, or Carthusian Monastery, of Florence. On the threatened advance of the Austro-Russian army in the following year, he was transferred to Grenoble, and finally to Valence on the Rhone, where, worn out by age and by the rigor of confinement, he died in August, 1799, in the 82nd year of his age, and the 24th of his pontificate.... After the death of Pious VI., Cardinal Chiaramonte was chosen his successor (March 14, 1800). Rome, which up to this time had been in the occupation of the French, was not restored to the papal authority, and the July of that year Pious VII. entered into his capital.”*SITI November 12, 1885, page 678.16*

Thus we see that from 538 to 1798 A.D. there were 1260 years of unbroken power. Plainly fulfilling the prophecy. It would be interesting to study the position of papal Rome before and after this period of supremacy, but that will have to be deferred till another time. E. J. W. *SITI November 12, 1885, page 678.17*

“Which Is Evangelical?” The Signs of the Times, 11, 43.

E. J. Waggoner

The following is a portion of an editorial note in the *Pacific* of June 10-: *SITI November 12, 1885, page 680.1*

“The election of the Rev. Edward White to the chairmanship of the Congregational Union of England and Wales is sure to be noted as indicating the tendencies of belief among the Independent there. Mr. White is by far the most pronounced and prominent advocate of the doctrine of ‘eternal life only in Christ.’ Of course, he was not elected because of his advocacy of that tenet. He is a man of great energy and ability, and has done yeoman service for the Free Churches of England. He is also a thoroughly Evangelical minister, if we act except this particular divergence.” *SITI November 12, 1885, page 680.2*

And “evangelical minister,” according to Webster, is one who is “earnest for the truth taught in the gospel; fervent and devout; strict in interpreting Christian doctrine;” and the *Pacific* says that one who believes that we have a “eternal life only in Christ,” is not, in that particular, evangelical. Let us see whether Mr. White or the *Pacific* is evangelical on the immortality question. The New Testament must, of course, decide the matter. *SITI November 12, 1885, page 680.3*

To start with, we take that most wonderful of texts, *John 3:16*: “For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” What do we learn from this verse? *SITI November 12, 1885, page 680.4*

1. That God’s love for the world was so great as to cause him to

send his Son for their rescue. We can judge something of God's love for his Son, when we remember that Christ was the brightest of the Father's glory, "and the express image of his person," that he was "heir of all things," the one by whom the worlds were made (*Hebrews 1:2, 3*); and that "in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." *Colossians 2:9*. God is infinite in all his attributes and therefore his love for his Son was infinite. And since he gave his Son for the world, we know how great was his love for the world. It was infinite.*SITI November 12, 1885, page 681.1*

2. The worth of the sacrifice shows the extent of the need. God would not lightly give his Son to suffer and die; it must be that without that gift there was no possibility for man to be rescued from his condition, and to receive that which was offered to him.*SITI November 12, 1885, page 681.2*

3. We are plainly told that this wonderful sacrifice was made that those who would believe in Christ might not perish, but that they might have everlasting life. Men can believe in Christ and have everlasting life, or he can disbelief and perish. There is no other alternative. The choice is not between happiness and misery, but between life and death. With eternal life in the presence of God, happiness must necessarily be associated, but it is secondary. Eternal life is what Christ says we get by believing on him. To deny that we get to eternal life only through Christ, is to deny the words of Christ. Mr. White accepts the words of Christ; the *Pacific* says, Not so. Which is evangelical?*SITI November 12, 1885, page 681.3*

Let us imagine that Nicodemus held to the doctrine of inherent immortality, as advocated by the *Pacific* and many others. Then when Christ said, "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life," Nicodemus would have recorded, "Well, he needn't have gone to all that trouble, for we shall have the eternal life any way. If that's what you came for, you came to no purpose." Do you say that such language would be insulting? We admit it, but how many are saying the same thing to-day!*SITI November 12, 1885, page 681.4*

The doctrine of "eternal life only in Christ" is not evangelical, says

the *Pacific*. Then the author of the gospel must be declared unevangelical; for he says, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." *John 3:36*. Is not this eternal life only in Christ? *SITI November 12, 1885, page 681.5*

Other texts are simply a repetition of the statement already made. Says Christ, "I am come that they might have life." *John 10:10*. Says the *Pacific*, "You are too late; we have it already." *SITI November 12, 1885, page 681.6*

Again the Saviour said to the unbelieving Jews: "Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life." *John 5:40*. We can imagine the pitiful tone in which he spoke these words, and the sorrow of his heart, as "he came unto his own, and his own received him not." And then to think that he knew all that this coming implied, the agony in the garden, the brutal insults and cruel scourging in the judgment hall, and the shameful death on the cross, what for? "That they might have life." Was Christ deceived? Was his anxious solicitude for man called a mistake? and was his sacrifice a useless waste of life? Evidently so, if men could have life outside of Christ. But he was not deceived; none so well as he could know man's terrible need, and the eternal destruction that must follow if the sacrifice was not made. Then how terribly deceived must those be who, in response to Christ's pathetic appeal, virtually say, "We don't need to come to you that we might have life; we can get it without your assistance." Fatal delusion! What an insult to the Son God! *SITI November 12, 1885, page 681.7*

Once more. Said Christ, in that wonderful prayer which was not for the apostles alone, but for them who should believe through their word: "Father, ... glorify thy Son, ... as thou hast given him power over all flesh, *that he should give eternal life* to as many as thou hast given him. And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent." *John 17:1-3*. Would the *Pacific* say that Christ was "thoroughly evangelical, if we except this particular divergence"? *SITI November 12, 1885, page 681.8*

Perhaps the *Pacific* has another standard of evangelicalism. But for

“this particular divergence,” Mr. White would be “a thoroughly Evangelical minister.” Divergence from what? Not from the Testament and the teaching of Christ, as we have clearly seen. What then? Ah, now we have it. The Rev. Edward White is a Congregationalist, and in general holds to the doctrines which the Congregationalist body holds in common with the great mass of professed Christians. But this same mass of professed Christians does not accept the doctrine of “eternal life only in Christ,” and it is in “this particular divergence” that Mr. White is unevangelical. If it were not for that, he would be “thoroughly evangelical.” Then it is evident that, according to the *Pacific*, popular belief, and not the New Testament, is the standard of evangelical principles. Popularity seems to be the accepted standard; but in spite of the great number on the popular side, we can’t help believing that the Bible is true, and that Jesus meant what he said.*SITI November 12, 1885, page 681.9*

What is a record? “And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.” *1 John 5:11, 12*. Is not this “eternal life only in Christ”? It certainly is, and it is evangelical doctrine, too.*SITI November 12, 1885, page 681.10*

“For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life of Jesus Christ our Lord.” *Romans 6:23*. “No, no,” says the *Pacific*, “Paul is mistaken; eternal life doesn’t come ‘through Jesus Christ our Lord;’ or, even if it does sometimes come through him, we can get it without him just as well.” Again we ask, Which is evangelical?*SITI November 12, 1885, page 681.11*

Sometimes people say, “Well, it is of no practical importance what you believe concerning the immortality of the soul.” We think that the intelligent reader can see that it is of a great deal of importance. It is a question of whether we shall give Christ the honor that is his due, or whether we shall withhold from him all his honor. One of his titles is “our life.” See *Colossians 3:4*. Nowhere in the Bible can we find that he came for any other purpose than to give life to those who would believe on him. His sole object in coming to earth to suffer and die, was to give life. And now if we say that Christ did not bring “life and immortality to light through the gospel,” but that

Socrates or Plato brought it to light, then we exalt a heathen philosopher above Christ, and rob the Lord of glory of his crown. The work of Spiritualism to-day is to convince men that they have life in themselves, instead of in Christ; and thousands who profess to be evangelical, and to abhor Spiritualism, are doing their best to help along that delusion of Satan. And this popular doctrine, which is so flattering to the pride of the human heart, that man is not dependent for eternal life on any source outside of himself, is that which will eventually sweep millions of professed lovers of the Lord into the ranks of those who openly blaspheme his name.*SITI November 12, 1885, page 681.12*

Reader, where do you stand? Do you profess to love the Lord Jesus Christ? Then do not any longer refuse to acknowledge that which will constitute his crown of glory and rejoicing. "My little children, let us not love in word, neither in tongue; but in deed and in truth." *1 John 3:18*. E. J. W.*SITI November 12, 1885, page 681.13*

November 19, 1885

“The Little Horn of *Daniel 8*” The Signs of the Times, 11, 44.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—DEC. 12

No Authorcode

The Little Horn of *Daniel 8*

In a previous lesson we have had mentioned of the little horn of *Daniel 8*, and we there took occasion to state that this little horn must not be confounded with that of *Daniel 7*. The latter, as we of seen, refers to the papacy only, to Rome during only a part of its career; the former refers to the whole duration of Rome, both in its pagan and papal forms, and covers the same ground as the fourth beast and all of its horns. The truth of this may be verified by an examination of the prophecy. *SITI November 19, 1885, page 694.1*

Verses 20, 21 of chapter 8, plainly tell us that the ram and the goat, the two powers that preceded the little horn, represented Medo-Persia and Grecia. But these two empires were the second and third in a series of four universal empires which cover the entire history of the world from about 625 B.C., beginning with Babylon. The prophecies of *Daniel 2* and *7* show that there were to be but four kingdoms. Then since there was but one to come after Grecia, whatever universal empire we find after that empire must be the one. From *Luke 2:1* we have seen that Rome filled the specifications as a universal empire; and therefore it must be represented by the little horn, for that was to be greater than any of its predecessors. *SITI November 19, 1885, page 694.2*

We will now notice a few of the characteristics of this little horn, and show their fulfillment in the Roman power. *Verses 23 and 24* described it best: “And in the latter time of their kingdom, when the

transgressors are come to the full, a king of *fierce countenance*, and understanding dark sentences, shall stand up. And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power; and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper, and practice, and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people.” Compare this with *Deuteronomy 28:49, 50*: “The Lord shall bring a nation against thee from far, from the end of the earth, as swift as the eagle flieth; a nation whose tongue thou shalt not understand; a nation of fierce countenance, which shall not regard the person of the old, nor show favour to the young.” Note the similar expressions in the two passages. Fierceness of countenance may well be applied to a power that in *Daniel 7:7* is represented by a beast, “dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly;” and its destructive propensities, as brought out in the two passages, correspond to the statement in *Daniel 7:7*. “Understanding dark sentences,” said the angel to Daniel; “whose tongue thou shalt not understand,” said Moses. This also applies to the Romans, whose language, in the Latin, was entirely different from the Hebrew. With the languages of the neighboring countries, Assyria, Babylon, etc., the Hebrew tongue was closely related, but it had no connection with the Latin.*SITI November 19, 1885, page 694.3*

Read carefully the whole of *Deuteronomy 28:49-57*, which, as has been shown above, refers to the power mentioned in *Daniel 8:23, 24*, and then compare with it the following from the account by Josephus of the siege of Jerusalem by the Romans:-*SITI November 19, 1885, page 694.4*

“Now, of those that perished by famine and the city, the number was prodigious, and the miseries were unspeakable; for if so much as the shadow of any kind of food did anywhere appear, a war was commenced presently; and the dearest friends fell a-fighting one with another about it, snatching from each other the most miserable supports of life. Nor would men believe that those who were dying had no food; for the robbers would search them when they were expiring, lest anyone should have concealed food in their bosoms, and counterfeited dying, nay, these robbers gaped for want, and ran about stumbling and staggering along like mad dogs, and reeling against the doors of the houses like drunken men; they would also, in the great distress they were in, rush into the very same houses

two or three times in one and the same day. Moreover, their hunger was so intolerable, that it obliged them to chew everything, while they gathered such things as the most sordid animals would not touch, and endured to eat them; nor did they at length abstain from girdles and shoes; and the very leather which belonged to their shields they pulled off and gnawed; the very wisps of old hay became food to some; and some gathered up fibers, and sold a very small weight of them for four Attic (drachmae). But why do I describe the shameless impudence that the famine brought upon men in their eating inanimate things while I am going to relate a matter of fact, the like to which no history relates, either among the Greeks or barbarians!-it is so horrible to speak of it, and incredible when heard! I have indeed willingly omitted this calamity of force, that I might not seem to deliver what is so portentous to posterity, but that I have innumerable witnesses to it in my own age; and besides, by country would have had little reason to thank me for suppressing the miseries that she underwent at this time.*SITI November 19, 1885, page 694.5*

“There was a certain woman that dwelt beyond Jordan, her name was Mary; her father was Eleazar, of the village Bethhezob, which signifies *The House of Hyssop*. She was eminent for her family and her wealth, and had fled away to Jerusalem with the rest of the multitude, and was with them besieged therein at this time. The other effects of this woman had been already seized upon; such I mean as she had brought with her of Perea and removed to the city. What she had treasured up of besides, as also what food she had contrived to save, had been also carried off by the rapacious guards, who came every day running into her house for that purpose. This put the poor woman into a very great passion, and by the frequent reproaches and imprecations she cast at these rapacious villains, she had provoked them to anger against her; but none of them, either out of the indignation she had raised against herself, or out of commiseration of her case, would take away her life; and if she found any food she perceived her labors were for others, and not for herself; and it was now become impossible for her any way to find any more food, while the famine pierced through her very bowels and marrow, when also her passion was fired to a degree beyond the famine itself; nor did she consult with anything but with her passion and the necessity she was in. She then

attempted a most unnatural thing; and, snatching up her son, who was a child sucking at her breast, she said, "O thou miserable infant! for whom shall I preserve thee in this war, this famine, and this sedition? As to the war with the Romans, if they preserve our lives, we must be slaves? This famine also will destroy us, even before that slavery comes upon us; yet are these seditious rogues more terrible than both the other. Come on; be thou my food, and be thou a fury to these seditious variets and a by-word to the world, which is all that is now wanting to complete the calamities of us Jews."*SITI November 19, 1885, page 694.6*

"And soon as she had said this she slew her son; and then roasted him, and ate the one half of him, and kept the other half by her concealed. Upon this the seditious came in presently, and smelling the scent of this food, they threatened her that they would cut her throat immediately if she did not show them what food she had gotten ready. She replied that she had saved a very fine portion of it for them; and withal uncovered what was left of her son. Hereupon they were seized with a horror and amazement of mind, and stood astonished at the sight; she said to them, 'This is mine own son; and what hath been done was mine own doing! Come, eat of this food; for I have eaten of it myself! Do not you pretend to be either more tender than a woman, or more compassionate than a mother; but if you be so scrupulous, and do abominate this my sacrifice, as I have eaten the one half let the rest be preserved for me also.' After which, those men went out trembling, being never so much affrighted at anything as they were at this, and with some difficulty they left the rest of that meat to the mother. Upon which the whole city was full of this horrid action immediately; and while everybody laid this miserable case before their own eyes, they trembled, as if this unheard-of action had been done by themselves. So those that were thus distressed by the famine were very desirous to die; and those already dead were esteemed happy, because they had not lived long enough either to hear or to see such miseries."-*Wars of the Jews, Book 6, chap.8.SITI November 19, 1885, page 694.7*

If only one more point can be noted concerning this little horn, and that is to show the change from pagan to papal Rome, for that is expressly noted. We quote: "Yea, he magnified himself even to the prince of the host [evidently referring to Christ, see verse 25, last

clause], and by him the daily was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down. And a host was given him against the daily by reason of transgression, and it cast down the truth to the ground, and it practice, and prospered.” *Daniel 8:11, 12*. In this quotation we have purposely omitted the word *sacrifice*, because it is superfluous. There is nothing in the original that gives even the slightest hint of such a word. From *verse 13* we learn what should be understood after “daily.” “How long shall be the vision concerning the daily and the transgression of desolation?” The daily what? Why, the daily desolation, of course. So then we have in this chapter a mighty desolating power brought to view under two phases,-the daily desolation, and the transgression of desolation. These two expressions can refer to nothing else but the two great phases of Rome, paganism and papacy.*SITI November 19, 1885, page 694.8*

“By him the daily was taken away.” The change from pagan to papal Rome was effected by Rome itself, and not as a measure forced upon her by an outside power. It was the Roman emperors themselves, who, influenced by the bishops, decreed that Christianity should be the religion of the empire.*SITI November 19, 1885, page 694.9*

“And an host was given him against the daily.” Although the change from paganism to papacy was begun and consummated within Rome itself. It was not without help. The hordes of barbarous tribes came from the North and overran the Roman Empire, became identified with it, accepted its religion, and were active agents in converting (by force of arms) others to that religion. Says D’Aubigne:-*SITI November 19, 1885, page 694.10*

“But already the forests of the North had poured forth the most effectual promoters of papal power. The barbarians who had invaded the West, and settled themselves therein,-but recently converted to Christianity,-ignorant of the spiritual character of the church, and feeling the want of an external pomp of religion, prostrated themselves in a half savage and half heathen state of mind at the feet of the chief priest of Rome. At the same time the people of the West also submitted to him. First the Vandals, then the Ostrogoths, a short time after the Burgundians and the Alains,

then the Visigoths, and at last the Lombards and the Anglo-Saxon came bowing the knee to the Roman pontiff. It was the sturdy shoulders of the idolatrous children of the North, which elevated to the Supreme throne of Christendom a pastor of the banks of the Tiber.”-*Hist. Ref., Book 1, chap. 1, par. 51.* E. J. W.*SITI November 19, 1885, page 694.11*

“Making Trouble” The Signs of the Times, 11, 44.

E. J. Waggoner

“And it came to pass, when Ahab saw Elijah, that Ahab said unto him, Art thou he that troubleth Israel?” *1 Kings 18:17*. This question was asked when Elijah met Ahab as he and his servants were searching for water. What had Elijah done, that he should be accused of troubling Israel? He had rebuked them for their idolatry, into which they had been led by Ahab and his father. In consequence of the almost universal wickedness, Elijah had declared, from the Lord, that there should be no rain. For three years there had been no rain, and yet idolatry did not cease, nor did Ahab abate his wickedness. To some people it would seem that Elijah’s preaching was in vain, and that, since no one heeded it, it would have been better to leave the people to worship their idols in peace. And no doubt Ahab voiced the sentiment of the people, when he accused Elijah of being the author of all their trouble.*SITI November 19, 1885, page 696.1*

But what did Elijah say? “And he answered, I have not troubled Israel; but thou, and thy father’s house, in that ye have forsaken the commandment of the Lord, and thou hast followed Baalim.” Here Elijah threw the entire responsibility upon Ahab and his family, because they have led the people into idolatry. How could that be, when the people were enjoying the peace and quiet until Elijah came with his stern message? The reason is, the people were violating God’s commandments, a thing which always brings his displeasure. The judgments of God will be visited upon those who persist in violating his law. But God never punishes any people until he has faithfully warned them of their sin. This was the part which Elijah had performed. He was God’s messenger. After he had warned them to no purpose, a slight manifestation of God’s wrath

against ungodliness was made. But who was responsible for this manifestation of wrath? Was it Elijah? All will agree, with Elijah that the responsibility rested upon those who had done the wrong. The case against them is clear.*SITI November 19, 1885, page 696.2*

Now another point. Since even the people of Israel could not be induced to leave their idols and serve Jehovah (for although they acknowledge that the Lord is God, they went back into idolatry, and were destroyed as a nation in consequence), would it not have been better to leave them alone? If they were determined not to serve Jehovah, was it not wrong for Elijah to cause them to lose confidence in Baal, by showing his lack of power? Who will say yes? Not one. Baal-worship would do no good, and they might better worship nothing. There was no power in Baal to reward them for worshiping him, or to protect them from the wrath of Jehovah, and therefore they might as well be atheists as to serve Baal. No person will have the hardihood to say that the worship of Baal was any improvement on no worship at all. Now for the parallel.*SITI November 19, 1885, page 696.3*

In these days we find that a large majority of the people professing Christianity call the first day of the week the holy rest-day-the Lord's day. But God says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." Moreover, as he commanded the people anciently to break their images, so he commands people to trample upon Sunday as a day of rest, saying, "Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work." "Six days thou shalt work; but on *the* seventh day thou shalt rest." *Exodus 34:21. SITI November 19, 1885, page 696.4*

But now it comes to pass when the truth on the Sabbath question is preached, while very many acknowledge, and many more are convinced at heart, that the seventh day-Saturday-is the Bible Sabbath, very few have the courage of their convictions, and walk in obedience to the commandment. Still further, the most of those who are convinced that the seventh day is the Sabbath, and do not keep it, having seen the utter absence of any Bible proof to sustain the Sunday-Sabbath, very naturally lose much of their respect for that day. And on this account it is often said that the preaching of the seventh-day Sabbath has an injurious effect; it unsettles the

faith of many in regard to their present practice, while few make a radical change. We now ask, Is this an injury? and if it is, who is responsible for the injurious effects.*SITI November 19, 1885, page 696.5*

Is it more pleasing in the sight of God to keep Sunday than to regard no day as holy? To keep the first day and violate the seventh, is direct disobedience to God's law. Any transgression of the law is sin. To break the Sabbath, and keep no day at all, is also direct violation of the law. This also is sin. Who can say that the latter sin is worse than the former? And if it be decided that the second is the greater sin, what is the advantage, since both are sins? God does not tell us to choose the smaller of two sins, but to put away all sin.*SITI November 19, 1885, page 696.6*

Question: Is it simply a spirit of worship that is required by the first commandment, or is it the worship of a special object? You say, It is the worship of one particular Being,-the Lord of heaven and earth. Then the design of the commandment can in nowise be met by worshipping some other object? Of course not; for that commandment particularly forbids the worship of anything except the true God. Well, the fourth commandment requires the observance of a special day of the week-the seventh-and forbids the observance of any other. The commandment does not simply require rest in the abstract, but rest of the day which he has appointed. To offer him any other day, is simply to ask him to be satisfied with a counterfeit.*SITI November 19, 1885, page 696.7*

When a laborer goes to his employer's office to receive his wages, he confidently expects to receive the amount before agreed upon, in good coin. Will he be satisfied with counterfeit money? By no means. But will not the counterfeit money be better than nothing? Not a bit; indeed, it may prove to be worse than no money; for while he cannot purchase a morsel of bread with it, he may get into serious trouble if he attempts to pass it. We think the illustration will hold good in every particular when applied to the Sabbath question. The seventh day is the genuine Sabbath; it has God's stamp upon it. The Sunday is only a base counterfeit; it bears none of the marks of genuineness. Now while this counterfeit Sabbath is worth nothing, it may get us into serious trouble if we persist, in attempting

to pass it instead of the genuine. See *Revelation 14:9-12*. As with the counterfeit coin, so with the counterfeit Sabbath, *-honest* ignorance that it is counterfeit may be accepted as an excuse; but when the man is told, or has an opportunity to know, that the coin is counterfeit, what excuse can he make? His unbelief will not save him. *SITI November 19, 1885, page 696.8*

The one who detects a counterfeit coin, and informs the one who holds it that is of no value, is not called a troublesome fellow, although he materially mars the peace of the possessor of the coin. The one who made the base coin, and they who persist in circulating it, are the real enemies of their fellows. So those who make known the truth concerning the Lord's Sabbath and its counterfeit are the friends, not the enemies, of their fellow-men. They are obeying the command of God: "Cry aloud, spare not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and show my people there transgression, and the house of Jacob their sins." *SITI November 19, 1885, page 696.9*

The man who detects a counterfeit coin in his neighbor's possession does not offer a good one in its place; but those who show the worthlessness of the Sunday-sabbath, offer in its stead the Sabbath which bears the stamp of Jehovah, and which will be accepted at the gate of Heaven. If men refuse to accept the genuine, and go without any, it is their own fault. When the true Sabbath is presented, "Blessed is the man that doeth this, and the son of man that layeth hold on it; that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and keepeth his hand from doing any evil." *Isaiah 56:2*. E. J. W. *SITI November 19, 1885, page 696.10*

"'Numerical Designation' in the Sabbath Commandment" The Signs of the Times, 11, 44.

E. J. Waggoner

In an article recently quoted from the *Friend*, was the statement that the agitation of the Sabbath question tends to turn men's thoughts "away from the proper observance of the day, to the very subordinate question of its numerical designation." In that sentence the writer expressed a very popular idea, one which we regard as a

grave error, namely, that the “numerical designation” of the day is a minor affair in Sabbath observance. It seems to be the general idea that the main question concerning the Sabbath is, *How* should it be kept? and not, *When* should it be kept? We consider both questions highly important, but think their order should be reversed.*SITI November 19, 1885, page 696.11*

What is impossible to say that one of two things is more important than the other when both are absolutely essential, we may readily determine which of them must first be considered. We have therefore no hesitation in saying that the “numerical designation” of the day is the first thing of importance in considering the question of Sabbath observance. If a man is told, “You ought to keep the Sabbath day,” the first question he would ask, if he knew nothing at all about the subject, would be, “What is the Sabbath day?”*SITI November 19, 1885, page 696.12*

Now if we read the commandment we shall find that this is indeed the first point considered. “Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.”*SITI November 19, 1885, page 696.13*

We see that in the commandment the Sabbath is introduced as an institution already well known. Then the first thing after the commandment proper, which is contained in the first clause, is the “numerical designation” of the day. “Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.” So important did the Lord regard the “numerical designation” of the day, that he fixed that the very first thing. Then come directions for the proper observance of the day: “In it thou shalt not do any work.” That is, any of *thy* work, which must be performed in the preceding six days.*SITI November 19, 1885, page 696.14*

There are but seven days in a week, and the first day is the one

commonly called Sunday. Every calendar and dictionary bears witness to this. More than this, the chief and indeed the only reason given for Sunday observance is that it commemorates the resurrection of Christ. But the resurrection of Christ was on the first day of the week; and thus Sunday observance everywhere and always record their belief that Sunday is the first day of the week. To deny that fact would be to overthrow their only argument for Sunday observance. But just as surely as Sunday is the first day of the week, Saturday is the seventh day. Well, the Lord says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." If the "numerical designation" of the day is a matter of minor importance, will our friends please explain the fourth commandment? *SITI November 19, 1885, page 696.15*

We repeat that before we can consider the "proper observance of the day" of the Sabbath, it is absolutely necessary that we determine what particular day of the week the Sabbath is. For no matter how strictly we observe a day, abstaining from our own labor on it, and devoting its hours to the worship of God, that cannot constitute a "proper observance of the Sabbath," if the day itself is not the Sabbath. This fact seems so self-evident as to make argument useless. Moreover, if the rest and worship mentioned above be upon some one of the six days which God has devoted to labor, then that rest is not a proper observance of that day. We do not say that Sunday or Monday or any other day of the week may not be used, on occasions, for religious worship, but we do say that for a regular practice, the only "proper observance" of Sunday, as well as of the five days following, is labor. And the only "proper observance of the Sabbath" is rest and worship on the seventh day of the week, commonly called Saturday. And this we say "by the word of the Lord." See *Exodus 16:22-30; 20:8-11; Luke 23:54-56*. E. J. W. *SITI November 19, 1885, page 697.1*

"How It May Be Done" The Signs of the Times, 11, 44.

E. J. Waggoner

Says the Portland *Baptist*: "Let our ambition be *first* to make men Christians, *then* Baptists." And the *Herald of Truth* says: "All genuine denominational feeling responds to this, Amen." We

confess that we cannot understand such expressions. Is a Baptist more or less than a Christian? Neither of the papers referred to will claim that a Baptist is *more* than a Christian. To be a *Christian* is the highest point to which sanctified ambition can look. Well, then, is a Baptist *less* than a Christian? If so, why should the good brethren who conduct these papers wish to lower the standard of any who are in such a desirable position? We know that they would not, and therefore we conclude that according to their idea a Baptist *is* a Christian. We have no disposition to deny this; but if it is so, why do they not say directly that their ambition is to make men Baptists?*SITI November 19, 1885, page 697.2*

There is a spirit which, for want of a better name, might be called "denominational cowardice." It makes men fear to seem to place their own denomination above any other. We confess that we have no sympathy with such a spirit. We like to see people have decided convictions. If a man unites with a certain denomination, it should be because that denomination is, so far as he can learn, more nearly correct than any other; because it has more truth. And if it has more truth than any other, it certainly is better than any other; and if that is so, why should he be afraid to say so? And why should he not strive earnestly to bring into it both worldlings and members of those bodies that have not so much light?*SITI November 19, 1885, page 697.3*

We are strongly of the opinion that the true reason for this "undenominational" talk that is so common, is the underlying belief that there is really no vital difference between different religious bodies, the name being the chief one. The points of divergence are called "non-essentials." Well, then, this shows the weakness of the "National Reform" assertion that their work cannot result in a union of Church and State, because the men who are in the movement are representatives of all denominations, and of course would not single out any one for prominence to the exclusion of the rest. So we say, of course they would not; but, singing party names and "non-essentials," they would all unite as members of one body, for the enforcement of the "essentials" which they hold in common. And when we inquire for the points held by all denominations in a common, and which are regarded as the *essentials*, we find simply, Natural Immortality and Sunday.*SITI November 19, 1885, page*

697.4

If any one says that a union of one Church and State cannot be effected on this basis, and that it is not imminent, he certainly is blind to the things that are taking place all around him. E. J. W.*SITI*
November 19, 1885, page 697.5

November 26, 1885

“Pagan and Papal Rome” The Signs of the Times, 11, 45.

E. J. Waggoner

The vision of the eighth chapter of Daniel begins with the supremacy of Medo-Persian dominion, B.C. 538, and covers the remaining portion of the world's history till the close of time. The *25th verse* says that the power represented by the little horn, Rome, “shall the broken without hand.” This evidently refers to the same thing that is mentioned in *Daniel 2:34, 44, 45*, where the stone cut out without hands is represented as smiting the image on the feet and breaking up the entire image—all the kingdoms of earth—in pieces. *SITI November 26, 1885, page 710.1*

Paganism was the prevailing religion during the Medo-Persian and Grecian rule, during the first portion of the Roman Empire. In the vision of the second chapter of Daniel there is no distinction made between pagan Rome and Rome papal, but in every other prophecy the distinction is clearly marked. In the seventh chapter, pagan Rome is represented by the “dreadful and terrible” beast with teeth of iron and nails of brass. Papal Rome is represented by the “little horn” which came out from this beast. In reality, the beast, after the rise of the little horn, is papal Rome, *i.e.*, Rome under the popes. *SITI November 26, 1885, page 710.2*

In the 12th and 13th of Revelation the Roman power is brought to view. It is not difficult to identify the red dragon with seven heads and ten horns. It is represented as standing ready to devour a certain child as soon as it was born. This child we know is Jesus, from the fact that he is to “rule all nations with a rod of iron” (*verse 5*, compared *Psalms 2:7-9*), and he was “caught up to his throne.” These particulars will apply to no one but Jesus. And Rome, through Herod as its representative, stood ready to slay Jesus when he was born. See *Matthew 2*. The dragon, represents Rome. The question is, Does it represent the whole of Rome, or only a part? This can be answered when we have identified the next beast. *SITI November 26, 1885, page 710.3*

“And I stood upon the sand of the sea, and saw a beast rise up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns, and upon his heads the name of blasphemy. And the beast which I saw was like unto a leopard, and his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion; and the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority.... And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies; and power was given unto him to continue forty and two months. And he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven. And it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them; and power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations.” *SITI November 26, 1885, page 710.4*

Compare this description with what we are already familiar in *Daniel 7*, and there will be no difficulty in deciding that it also represents Rome. What! two symbols in succession representing the same thing? The answer must be that they represent two phases of Rome. Now we know that Rome in the time of Christ was pagan; therefore this second phase, represented by the leopard beast, must be papal Rome. Notice its blasphemous words, and its work of persecuting saints, and compare with the description of the little horn of *Daniel 7*. Notice also a time during which it was to have power to continue-“forty and two months.” This, at thirty days to the month, is just 1260 days (as prophetic symbols, years), which we have already learned was the period of papal supremacy. Here, then, as in the seventh of Daniel, the prophecy marks a change from pagan to papal Rome. *SITI November 26, 1885, page 710.5*

Once more we turn to the Roman power as brought to view in the eighth of Daniel. The little horn that waxed “exceeding great,” we have already seen to be Rome. There is no possibility of its representing any other power. But it is to be “broken without hand,” which shows that the little-horn power covers the whole of Roman history, reaching even to the coming of the Lord. This being the case, it is evident that here also we must have the two phases of Rome, -pagan and papal. How are these two phases indicated? First, we repeat that the word “sacrifice” which occurs in *verses 11, 12, and 13*, is not found in the original, and there is nothing in the text that gives any idea of sacrifice. In the face of this, the Revision

Committee, as if to get as far as possible from the true meaning of the passage, have placed “burnt-offering” in the Revised Version, in the place of “sacrifice.” This is simply making a bad matter worse. They could have used the word “persecution,” or “prophesying,” or “dreaming,” with just as much reason. Some one will ask, If there is no word in the original where the translators have placed “sacrifice,” why did they place any word there at all? It would have been better if they had not, for then no one would have been misled. Try it in *verse 13*: “Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain saint, How long shall be the vision concerning the daily and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden underfoot?” A very slight examination will convince anyone that the only word that can be properly supplied after “daily,” is ‘desolation;’ thus, “How long shall be the vision concerning the daily desolation and the transgression of desolations?” By supplying a word that is already in the text (and we have no right to go outside of the text for a word), we make harmony, and get rid of the real sense of the passage. *SITI November 26, 1885, page 710.6*

Rome, then, is here termed to a desolating power. Examine *Matthew 24:15, 16*, and *Luke 20:21, 22*, and you will find the Roman armies spoken of as the “abomination of desolation.” And this term, “desolation,” is a very fit one to apply to a power that shall “break in pieces and bruise,” and “shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and break it in pieces.” Then we have two forms of desolation, at the “daily” and the “transgression.” Rome in its pagan form was well indicated by the term “daily,” or “continual,” because paganism had been the main religion of the world from almost the beginning. A few people worshiped the true God; but these were so very few that it might well be said that paganism have always been the religion of the world. But under the Roman dominion a change was to take place. Paganism in the civilized world was to receive its death blow, and a form of worship professedly Christian was to take its place; yet this new form of religion was to be of such a character, as compared with paganism, that it was called the “transgression.” It is doubtful if the abomination of paganism for four thousand years equaled the crimes perpetrated by papal Rome in its twelve centuries of supreme power. *SITI November 26, 1885, page 710.7*

This same change is set forth by Paul in the *second chapter of 2 Thessalonians*. He told the Thessalonians brethren that the day of the Lord could not come until there had come an apostasy, and the “man of sin” had been revealed, and had accomplished his work of blasphemy and opposition to God and history. Said he, “Remember ye not that when I was yet with you, I told you these things?” That it is, when he was in Thessalonica he preached to them from the book of Daniel concerning the rise of the papacy. “And now he know what withholdeth that he the man of sin might be revealed in his time.” That is, you know what now hinders the setting up of the papacy; it is paganism, which still has a controlling influence in the government. “For the mystery of the iniquity doth already work; only he who now letteth hindereth will let hinder, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that Wicked be revealed.” *Verses 7, 8*. The apostasy had begun in Paul’s day. “Grievous wolves” had already begun to devour the flock, and men speaking perverse things had drawn many away. This spirit of the papacy-“the mystery of the iniquity”-was already existing; but it could not fully develop itself until paganism-the hindering power-should be “taken of the way,” and then “that Wicked” should stand forth undisguised. *SITI November 26, 1885, page 710.8*

Note the similarity in the terms used by Paul and the angel in describing the papacy. The angel calls it “the transgression of desolation;” Paul calls it “that Wicked,” just as though the papacy embraced all the wickedness in the world, and so it did. The papacy was to be so pre-eminently wicked that it could be sufficiently designated by the expression “that Wicked.” *SITI November 26, 1885, page 710.9*

In *Revelation 13:2*, the change from paganism to papacy is noted in these words: “And the dragon [pagan Rome] gave him of [that is, the beast, papal Rome] his power, and his seat, and great authority.” If any one, however supposes that this change was an instantaneous one, accomplished by a sudden revelation, he is greatly mistaken. For several hundred years the papal power was growing almost unnoticed, before it succeeded in exalting itself above the ruins of paganism. Paul, *2 Thessalonians 2:6-8*, brings this state of things to view, when he represents the “mystery of the iniquity” as working, but obliged to wait for its full development until

paganism should be removed. We propose to give a few quotations that will indicate, as fully as is possible in our brief space, the rise of the papacy and the overthrow of paganism.*SITI November 26, 1885, page 710.10*

"In the last great persecution under Diocletian [A. D. 284-305], the bishops of Rome probably fled once more to the Catacombs. Their churches were torn down, their property confiscated, their sacred writings destroyed, and a vigorous effort was made to extirpate the powerful sect. But the effort was vain. Constantine soon afterward became emperor, and the Bishop of Rome emerged from the Catacombs to become one of the ruling powers of the world. This sudden change was followed by an almost total loss of the simplicity and purity of the days of persecution. Magnificent churches were erected by the emperor in Rome, adorned with images and pictures, where the bishop sat on a lofty throne, encircled by inferior priests, and performing rites borrowed from the splendid ceremonial of the pagan temple. The Bishop of Rome became a prince of the empire, and lived in a style of luxury and pomp that awakened the envy or the just indication of the heathen writer, Marcellinus. The church was now enriched by the gifts and bequests of the pious and the timid; the bishops drew great revenues from his farms in the Campagna and his rich plantations in Sicily; he rode through the streets of Rome in a stately chariot and clothed in gorgeous attire; his table was supplied with a profusion more than imperial; the proudest women of Rome loaded him with lavish donations, and followed him with their flatteries and attentions; and his haughty bearing and profuse luxury were remarked upon by both pagans and Christians as strangely inconsistent with the humility and simplicity enjoined by the faith which he professed. The bishopric of Rome now became a splendid prize, for which the ambitious and unprincipled contended by force or fraud."-*Historical Studies*, pp. 17, 18.*SITI November 26, 1885, page 710.11*

Constantine became sole emperor of Western of Rome in 312 A.D. Shortly after (March, 313), he issued the famous Edict of Milan, which restored all forfeited civil and religious rights to the Christians, and it secured to them equal toleration with the pagans throughout the empire. This was an important step in advance. Gibbon,

speaking of Constantine's relation to Christianity, says: "By the edicts of toleration, he removed the temporal disadvantages which had hitherto regarded the progress of Christianity.... The exact balance of the two religions continued but a moment; and the piercing eye of ambition and avarice soon discovered that the profession of Christianity might contribute to the interest of the present as well as of the future life. The hopes of wealth and honors, the example of an emperor, his exhortations, his irresistible smile, diffused conviction among the venal and obsequious crowds which usually filled the apartments of a palace.... As the lower ranks of society are covered by imitation, the conversion of those who possessed any imminence of birth, of power, or of riches, was soon followed by [the conversion of] dependent multitudes."-*Decline and Fall*, chap. 20, par. 18.*SITI November 26, 1885, page 711.1*

In his "History of Latin Christianity," book one, chapter 2, Milman quotes a single paragraph from an ancient historian, which shows the advancement made by the bishop of Rome by the close of the fourth century: "No wonder that for so magnificent a prize as the bishopric of Rome, then should contest with the utmost eagerness and obstinacy. To be enriched by the lavish donations of the principal females of the city; to ride, splendidly attired, in a stately chariot; to sit at a profuse, luxuriant, more than imperial, table,- these are of the rewards of successful ambition." *SITI November 26, 1885, page 711.2*

In the same chapter, Milman again says:-*SITI November 26, 1885, page 711.3*

"The Pontificates of Damasus and Siricius [A.D. 367-398] beheld almost the last open struggles of expiring Roman paganism, the dispute concerning the Statue of Victory in the Senate, the succession of a large number of the more distinguished senators, the pleadings of the eloquent Symmachus for the toleration of the religion of ancient Rome. To such humiliation were reduced the deities of the Capitol, the gods, who, as was supposed, had achieved the conquest of the world, and laid it at the feet of Rome. But in this great contest the Bishop of Rome filled only an inferior part; it was Ambrose, the bishop of Milan, who enforced the final sentence of condemnation against paganism, asserted the sin, in a

Christian emperor, of assuming any Imperial title connected with pagan worship, and of permitting any portion of the public revenue to be expended on the rites of idolatry. It was Ambrose who forbade the last marks of respect to the titular divinities of Rome in the public ceremonies.”*SITI November 26, 1885, page 711.4*

The final triumph of the pseudo-Christian religion was gained in the early part of the 6th century, when Pope Symmachus anathematized the Emperor Anastasius. See Cyclopedias, art. “Anastasius,” and “Decline and Fall,” chap. 47, par. 22. At the same time, paganism in the West was overthrown by Clovis, king of Franks, a cruel and bloodthirsty tyrant, who had been converted to the Christianity that was then popular, by his wife, Clothilde, who was a Catholic. Clovis had promised her that if he were victorious in a battle which he was about to fight near Cologne, A.D. 496, he would turn Christian. After a severe struggle, he gained the victory, and soon after had and several thousand of his followers were baptized. He afterward, A.D. 507-8, by virtue of his superior skill and strength in battle, succeeded in “converting” the entire nation of the Visigoths, so that Christianity became the nominal religion of the entire Roman world. (See “Decline and Fall,” chap. 38, par. 1-30; Guizot’s “History of France,” vol., chap. 7.) Because of these Christian acts, he received from the pope the title of “Most Christian King.”*SITI November 26, 1885, page 711.5*

Thus was the “continual desolation” taken away that the “transgression of desolation” might run its course. In A.D. 538, as previously shown, the papacy became supreme by the conquest of its rivals, and it pursued its career unchecked until 1798. Since then its temporal power has gradually become extinct, but its spiritual power, though seemingly limited, is greater than ever. Its opposition to “all that is called God, or that is worshiped,” has not diminished, nor will it cease until the Lord shall consume that Wicked with the spirit of his mouth, and destroy it with the brightness of his coming. *2 Thessalonians 2:8. E. J. W. SITI November 26, 1885, page 711.6*

“Judged by the Law” The Signs of the Times, 11, 45.

E. J. Waggoner

“For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law; ... in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ.” *Romans 2:12-16.SITI November 26, 1885, page 712.1*

In the two verses here quoted, there is matter for our most serious consideration, which does not appear from a casual reading. In them are brought to view the Judgment. We speak of the day of Judgment as “The day of wrath, that dreadful day,” and it is doubtful if any one can really *think* of that day without feelings of awe or terror; yet no one can have any just appreciation of its awfulness unless he has carefully studied the law of God, by which men are then to be judged; and our sense of the terrors of that day will be exactly in proportion to our understanding of the far-reaching sanctions of that holy law.*SITI November 26, 1885, page 712.2*

The verses before us mention two classes,-those who have sinned without law, and those who, having sinned in the law, are to be judged by the law. The second class is the one with which we are specially concerned; but before we can fully comprehend what is said of it, we must briefly notice the class with which it is contrasted.*SITI November 26, 1885, page 712.3*

This text gives no authority whatever for the theory that there are any people in the world on whom God’s law has no claims. The term “without law” is fully explained in *verses 14 and 15*, which are parenthetical. “For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature of the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves; which show the work of *the law written in their hearts*, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another.”*SITI November 26, 1885, page 712.4*

In the first chapter of Romans, the heathen, here spoken of as those “without the law,” are described. There it is plainly shown that their ignorant blindness is due to their own willful disobedience. “Because that when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but because vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened.” *Romans 1:21*. There was a time

when all men knew God; but now many have been given over to “a reprobate mind.” Notwithstanding this, every man who has not driven the Spirit of God from him forever, has as a legacy from Adam in his purity, some trace of the law of God in his heart. It was not alone in outward form, but in character as well, that Adam was formed in the image of God. Man in his first estate was like God, holy, because God’s law, which is the transcript that his character, was within his heart. When he fell, this image was marred. Each successive sin makes an additional blot upon that copy of the law in the heart, until, by a long course of sin, it is completely obliterated. Christ, the sinless One, said “I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, I law is within my heart.” *Psalms 40:8*. The work of the gospel is to bring men back to their lost allegiance, to reconcile them to God (2 *Corinthians 5:20*), and write the entire law once more in their hearts (*Jeremiah 31:33; Hebrews 8:10*), that thus they may be wholly conformed to God’s image, “partakers of the divine image.” *SITI November 26, 1885, page 712.5*

Paul says that the heathen, who have not the written law, give evidence of traces of the law written in their hearts, from the fact that when they do things that are commanded or forbidden by the law, their conscience bears witness, and their thoughts either accuse or else excuse the commission of those deeds. The contrast, then, between “without the law,” and “in the law,” is simply a contrast between no revelation and God’s written word; and the two classes brought to view are those who have not the Bible, and those who have the full light of the written word of God. *SITI November 26, 1885, page 713.1*

It is evident, then, that those who “perish without law,” are those who are punished for the sins which they have committed in face of the law which they had by nature. They had the law; for sin is imputed to them (*verse 12*), and “sin is not imputed where there is no law.” *Romans 5:13*. But they did not have the written law; consequently the written law, in its wondrous breadth, is not brought against them in the Judgment; they are judged simply by as much of the law as they had, and this alone is sufficient to condemn them. *SITI November 26, 1885, page 713.2*

Now it is still further evident that this judgment of the heathen can

go but little, if any, further than the bare letter of the law. That is, for instance, the law will take cognizance, in the case of the heathen, only of the actual murder which he committed when he knew that he ought not to kill, and will not bring before him the envy and jealousy, which, in the absence of the written word, he perhaps did not recognize as being wrong. But “*all unrighteousness is sin*” (1 *John 5:17*), and “*the wages of sin is death*” (*Romans 6:23*), and therefore “*for his iniquity that he hath done shall he die.*” This, in brief, is what is meant by “*not having the law,*” and by perishing “*without law.*” *SITI November 26, 1885, page 713.3*

Now what of those to having “*sinned in the law,*” are to be “*judged by the law*”? We have already seen that this class comprises those who have the light of the written revelation. Then since they are to be judged by what they have, it is evident that they are to be judged by all that may be learned from the word of God. Instead of being judged according to the mere letter of the law, *i.e.*, by that which may be understood by merely *reading* the law, they are to be judged according to the fullest intent of the law,-by all that may be understood by earnest, prayerful meditation in the law. *SITI November 26, 1885, page 713.4*

In *Hebrews 4:12* we read that the “*word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.*” From the sermon on the mount,-that sermon that moralists are so fond of quoting, we learn that he who is unjustly angry with another is in as much danger of the Judgment as he who takes another’s life; and John plainly declares that “*whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer.*” 1 *John 3:15*. Again our Saviour said: “*Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery.*” *Matthew 5:27*. Here Christ quotes the seventh commandment as something known of old. All knew the penalty for violating it; but the scribes and Pharisees had taught that nothing but adultery as an actually accomplished fact could be considered a violation of the commandment. But Christ said of it, “*But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh upon a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.*” *SITI November 26, 1885, page 713.5*

These two instances, which are but samples of what might be said of all the commandments, serve to give us some idea of what the psalmist sought in the law when he said, "I have seen an end of all perfection; but thy commandment is exceeding brought." *Psalms 119:96*. So broad is it that it takes notice of an unexpressed thought or a single glance of the eye. *SITI November 26, 1885, page 713.6*

We claim that it is the law in its depth and breadth, the law as it discerns the thoughts and intents of the heart, to which Paul refers when he says of a certain class that they shall be "judged by the law." This claim is sanctioned by the verse which says that this judgment shall take place "in the day when God shall judge the *secrets* of men." It is evident there is a difference between the judgment of those who sin "without law" and that of those who sin "in the law." Now what can this difference be, since, as we have already seen, the law is the standard of judgment in both cases? The only difference can be that the latter class endure a more rigid test than the former. *SITI November 26, 1885, page 713.7*

Notice, further, that the phrase "in the law" refers to *all* who have the written word, and that therefore this rigid test, which is going to take into account the remotest thoughts of the heart, is to be applied to every one who has the Bible, that is, to all the inhabitants of so-called Christian lands. That is that which may well cause us all to tremble at the thought of "that dreadful day." Multitudes who pride themselves on their strict morality will be found in that day to be but whited sepulchers, fair without, but full of corruption within. Thousands of professed Christians who stand high in the estimation of their brethren, perhaps also in their own estimation, will then be bidden to depart as "workers of iniquity;" "for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart." *SITI November 26, 1885, page 713.8*

In this connection we also have another thought worthy of serious consideration. After enumerating the vices of the heathen (*Romans 1:24-32*), Paul continues: "Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest; for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest *doest the same things*." *Romans 2:1*. Now there is not an individual who has ever read *Romans 1:24-32* who has not decided that the things there set

forth are exceedingly wrong. But the apostle says, "Thou that judgest doest *the same things*." What! have we all committed murder and adultery? are we all guilty of all that list of outbreking sins? Not openly; so far as the actual *deed* is concerned, we may have committed scarcely any of those acts. But we have all harbored the thoughts which, if cherished and allowed to pursue their actual course, would develop into those very sins. We have already seen that a wrong desire is counted as a violation of the commandment; but here we learn something further. We learn that the *evil thought* cherished by one who has the light of God's word, is in the sight of God as great a crime as the actual deed is when committed by a heathen. The professed Christian who indulges in anger or harbors evil thoughts is as guilty before God as the benighted heathen who kills and eats his enemy. *SITI November 26, 1885, page 713.9*

We begin to see that the commandment is indeed "exceeding broad;" we may also feel a little less satisfied over the superiority above the heathen, which we fancy we enjoy. As we read of the Hindoo throwing himself before the car of Juggernaut, or perchance see the Chinaman bowing before his horrid-looking Joss, or think of the barbarous rites with which savage worship is accompanied, we shudder at the depth of wickedness revealed. But when we read that "rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry," we may well turn upon ourselves the look of pity and scorn. How many professed Christians are there who are never stubbornly set upon carrying out their own plans, regardless of the wishes of their brethren? Comparatively few, we fear, always follow the directions laid down in *1 Corinthians 1:10* and *1 Peter 5:5*. How many who profess to keep "the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus," never indulge any rebellious feelings? It may be rebellion against duty which God has made known through the spirit of prophecy, or against those placed in authority. Whatever it is, the rebellious or stubborn one is as vile in God's sight as the one who "in his blindness bows down to wood and stone." Is there not cause for us all to cry out, "God be merciful to me, *the sinner*"? *SITI November 26, 1885, page 713.10*

And to give force to these thoughts we have the assurance that, "the great day of the Lord is near, it is near, and *hasteth greatly*."

The Lord is near, “even at the doors,” and when he comes, he will “bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts.” *1 Corinthians 4:5*. And what weight against us those hidden and seemingly insignificant thoughts will have. How often we would gladly forget them; sometimes we succeed. But sooner or later they will be made known in all their terrible heinousness. What shall we do? Let us face them now. Let us pray in the Lord, “Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law.” “Let us search and try our ways, and turn again to the Lord;” “let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts;” and we have the blest assurance that if we do this God will “abundantly pardon,” and will “cleanse us from all unrighteousness.” E. J. W.*SITI November 26, 1885, page 713.11*

“Shifting Responsibility” The Signs of the Times, 11, 45.

E. J. Waggoner

The following paragraph we recently came across in a religious exchange:-*SITI November 26, 1885, page 713.12*

“In a recent address Professor Drummond said that he was once conversing with an infidel, when a well-known gentleman passed them on the road. ‘That gentleman,’ said the infidel, pointing to the passer-by, ‘is the founder of our infidel club.’ ‘What,’ said Mr. Drummond, in startled tones, ‘why that is Mr. So-and-so, an influential man in such a church!’ ‘Yes,’ said the infidel, ‘we know he professes Christianity; but his inconsistencies have driven many of us into infidelity, and led to the founding of our club.’”*SITI November 26, 1885, page 713.13*

From the above, which is undoubtedly true, there are two lessons to be learned. The first is that Christians, if they are not consistent in their life, are active agents of the devil. Says Christ: “He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad.” *Matthew 12:30*. Many professed Christians would be shocked to be told that they are doing missionary work for Satan, yet they can easily convince themselves that such is the case. Let them seriously ask, Am I doing my duty? Do I honor Christ and the

profession that I make? Is my influence positive on the Lord's side? Unless these questions can be answered affirmatively, they may know that they are driving men away from Christ. The name of God is blasphemed because of the lives of any of his professed followers. *Romans 2:21-24*. How terrible to think that there is more blasphemy than there would be if many who profess to love God were not in existence. *SITI November 26, 1885, page 713.14*

Some professors think to make amends by acknowledging their false position without correcting it. They will try to teach unbelievers, but will say, "Don't take me for an example; you must not judge of Christianity by me." But that is just what the world must do. Christians are here in order that this world may be able to judge of Christianity. Said Christ to his disciples; "Ye are the light of the world;" and he prayed that they might "be made perfect in one," so that the world might know that he was from God. One of the first things the professor of Christianity should think about is that worldlings will watch him closely, and that they will know whether he is really a Christian or not. They can tell the genuine article every time. *SITI November 26, 1885, page 714.1*

And this brings us to the second lesson that may be learned from the paragraph quoted. It is this: The fact that professed Christians do not fulfill their obligations, is not the slightest excuse for anybody's unbelief. Whenever worldlings criticize the inconsistencies of professed Christians, they at once condemn themselves; for by their criticisms they show that they know what ought to be done. And their punishment for evil-doing will be none the less because it was a professed Christian who led them astray. As for the professor, the Judgment alone will reveal the responsibility that attaches to him for his scattering influence. Taking it all together, neither Christians nor infidels have anything from which to derive comfort for a course of wrong-doing. E. J. W. *SITI November 26, 1885, page 714.2*

December 3, 1885

“Vain Customs” *The Signs of the Times*, 11, 46.

E. J. Waggoner

In an editorial on “Infant Baptism,” in a recent number of the *California Christian Advocate*, we find, among others equally sound, the following ‘argument’ for that practice:-*SITI December 3, 1885, page 728.1*

“Is it not an assumption almost amounting to impudence, to be told that infant baptism has no foundation whatever, when its history is so prominent and its practice so general through all the ages? Can it be possible that a small portion of the church has all the truth, and the rest of us, constituting a vast majority in every century, has [*sic.*] none at all?”*SITI December 3, 1885, page 728.2*

Before answering this question, let us have a few figures. The population of the earth is not far from fourteen millions of people. Of this number about 480,000,000 are Buddhists and followers of Confucius; about 230,000,000 are barbarous tribes that practice fetichism,-the very lowest form of heathenism; something over 120,000,000 are Mohammedans, and about the same number are Brahminical Hindoos. Less than 400,000,000 our nominally Christian, of this number nearly 300,000,000 are members of the Roman Catholic and Greek Churches, leaving only a little over one hundred million of so-called Protestants of all denominations, including infidels, etc. That is, over seven hundred million people, one-half the population of the earth, are heathen, and less than one-third of the inhabitants of the earth have even a knowledge of the religion which teaches that there is one God, and of Jesus Christ whom he sent.*SITI December 3, 1885, page 728.3*

Now we might answer the *Advocate’s* question by the Yankee method of asking another: “Is it not an assumption almost amounting to impudence, to be told that” the worship of images “has no [Biblical] foundation whatever, when its history is so prominent and its practice so general throughout of the ages?” Can it be possible that a small portion of mankind has all the truth, and

that the rest, constituting a vast majority in every century, has none at all?*SITI December 3, 1885, page 729.1*

We have stated that of the so-called Christians, only one-fourth are Protestants. The rest believe in purgatory, prayers to and for the dead, and various other things which the *Advocate* considers pernicious. Is it not “an assumption almost amounting to impudence,” for a few Protestants to oppose the doctrine held by so large a body of “Christians,” many of whom are skilled in all the learning of the schools? Hear what the Catholic Dr. Eck said, over three hundred years ago, to Luther, who was opposing the presumptuous claims of the pope:-*SITI December 3, 1885, page 729.2*

“I am astonished at the humility and diffidence with which the reverend doctor undertakes to stand alone against so many illustrious Fathers, thus affirming that he knows more of these things than the sovereign pontiff, the councils, divines, and universities! It would no doubt be very wonderful if God had hidden the truth from so many saints and martyrs, till the advent of the reverend father.”*SITI December 3, 1885, page 729.3*

Just compare this paragraph with the first one quoted. We might almost accuse the *Advocate* of plagiarizing from the learned chancellor of Ingolstadt. If the *Advocate's* argument for infant baptism be sound, then Dr. Eck's sarcastic remarks proved the fallacy of Luther's position; and the same argument proves that paganism is the only true religion! We have no sympathy nor respect for that sort of argument.*SITI December 3, 1885, page 729.4*

Let us turn the tables. The Bible says, “He that *believeth* and is baptized shall be saved.” Infants are not capable of belief; but since they have committed no sin, they are saved by virtue of Christ's atoning blood, without belief. If they die in infancy, they never have any personal knowledge of sin. No one who does not or cannot is a subject for baptism, according to the Saviour's testimony. Now we ask, Is it not an assumption which is even worse than impudence, for men to say that infant “baptism” is a Christian ordinance, when in the whole Bible there is not a syllable in favor of it? We claim that

the presumption is all on the side of the seeming majority; for one man with the Bible to sustain him, may without presumption withstand the world.*SITI December 3, 1885, page 729.5*

If numbers and custom prove the correctness of any theory or practice, then all error must be correct. A few hundred years ago everybody believed that the earth was flat. According to the *Advocate's* reasoning, the earth at that time was flat; but since the time of Galileo it has gradually been assuming a spherical shape, until, now that nearly everybody believes it to be round, it is quite round, being only a little flattened at the poles! And this is no more absurd than that the most common argument for infant "baptism" and Sunday-keeping.*SITI December 3, 1885, page 729.6*

So true is it that the majority of people are, and always have been, in the wrong, that whenever we hear a person quote custom in favor of any practice, we at once decide, (1) That he has nothing better to offer, and (2) That the practice is, without doubt, wrong. We so decide because many hundred years ago, the prophet of God declared that "The customs of the people are vain" (*Jeremiah 10:3*), and inspired statements are true in all ages of world's history. E. J. W.*SITI December 3, 1885, page 729.7*

"Comments on *Psalm 15*" The Signs of the Times, 11, 46.

E. J. Waggoner

"Lord, who shall abide in thy tabernacle? who shall dwell in thy holy hill?" *Psalm 15:1*.*SITI December 3, 1885, page 729.8*

This is certainly a most pertinent question. If a person desires to go to a certain place, his first inquiry will be as to how he is to get there. Now there are few persons who do not have a desire for eternal life; few do not entertain a faint hope, though often without reason, that they will at last by some means have an entrance into the holy city. Then the question of the psalmist should be constantly on their minds; that is, they should constantly be searching for an answer to it. That no one will enter Heaven by accident; no one will dwell in the "holy hill" without knowing positively by what means he got there. As surely as the joys in the presence of the Lord are real,

so surely are the steps to them real. "We must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God." *Acts 14:22.SITI December 3, 1885, page 729.9*

Fortunately, we are not left to grope in darkness for the way to Zion, nor need we be at a loss to know when we have found it. The inspired psalmist has answered his own question. Let us then examine it together. Here is the first part of the answer:-*SITI December 3, 1885, page 729.10*

"He that walketh uprightly, and worketh righteousness, and speaketh the truth in his heart. He that backbiteth not with his tongue, nor doeth evil to his neighbour, nor taketh up a reproach against his neighbour." *Psalms 15:2, 3.SITI December 3, 1885, page 729.11*

The first clause seems to cover it all: "He that walketh uprightly." We hear a great deal nowadays about "crooked" dealings. The way that leads to life is too narrow to allow any "crooked" person to walk in it. Every one in it must be upright. Reader, do you realize what that means? Do any of us fully appreciate what it is to *do right*? It is simply to "keep straight" all the time; to be *upright*; to not deviate at all from a perfect standard. It is to "make straight paths for your feet," and to walk in them continually, and not simply occasionally. The great reason why many professed Christians make so little progress in the Christian life, is that they have so low a standard of Christianity.*SITI December 3, 1885, page 729.12*

What is the proper standard? John says: "He that saith he abideth in Him, ought himself also so to walk even as he walked." *1 John 2:6*. Christ is the perfect pattern. He is the way and the truth. He "did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth." *1 Peter 2:22*. This was because the law of God was in his heart. *Psalms 40:8*. Then if we would walk "uprightly," as Christ walked, we must also have the law of God in our hearts; for David says of the one who has the law of God in his heart, that "none of his steps shall slide." So if one wishes to know how much the law of God requires of him, let him examine carefully the life of Christ. In his life we see a living exemplification of the law. But if the law requires a walk like that of Christ, if perfect obedience to the law's requirements makes a man

like Christ, then certainly the law will condemn the one whose life is not like Christ's. If we deviate from the pattern which Christ has set, then we are condemned. Surely it is no small thing to be a Christian. But the psalmist has specified some things.*SITI December 3, 1885, page 729.13*

"He that ... speaketh the truth in his heart." Outwardly a man's deportment may be correct; his morals may be fully up to the standard of the very best society, and yet he may be a gross violator of the law, and may be more guilty before God than one who sins openly and recklessly. "Man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart." But no one must fall into the error that he can keep the law in his heart, and break it openly. Many have fallen into this error; for this is just what they mean when they talk about keeping the law in spirit and not in letter. "Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh;" and as a man "thinketh in his heart, so is he." A man may keep the law outwardly, and violate it really, in his heart; but it is an utter impossibility for any one to keep the law in his heart, and violate the letter of it. So if a man keeps the fourth commandment "in his heart," if he keeps the spirit of that commandment, he will keep holy the seventh day of the week, and no other.*SITI December 3, 1885, page 729.14*

"He that backbiteth not with his tongue, nor doeth evil to his neighbour, nor taketh up a reproach against his neighbour." *Verse 3.* Webster gives the following definition of the word "backbite"; "To censure, slander, reproach, or speak evil of, in the absence of the person traduced." Notice that according to this definition, backbiting is not necessarily speaking falsely against an absent one; the things said may be true, and yet it may be backbiting. It is speaking evil of a neighbor that is condemned. This is still farther shown by the expression, "Nor taketh up a reproach against his neighbor." If a man commits a sin, that is a reproach to him; for Solomon says that "sin is a reproach to any people." Now if one neighbor has actually done wrong, and we take up his case and make it a subject of conversation, criticizing it of course, we are backbiting. This of course does not include those instances in which a man's case is considered by those in positions of authority, with a view to reclaiming him, or of preventing him from leading others astray.*SITI*

December 3, 1885, page 729.15

If it is a sin to speak evil of one when the things uttered are true how much worse must it be when the reports are false? The ninth commandment says: "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor." This does not mean simply that we must not swear falsely against him in court, or that we must not at any time tell what we know is not true; but it means that we must not tell what we do not know to be true. The man who hears something to the detriment of his neighbor, and repeats it to others, not knowing that it is true, is guilty of bearing false witness, as well as of taking up a reproach against his neighbor. The ninth commandment means a great deal more than we are apt to think it does. And so it is with all the commandments. They are, indeed, "exceeding broad."*SITI December 3, 1885, page 729.16*

Here is a safe and simple rule to follow with our fellowmen: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." He who does this fulfills the whole law, so far as it relates to man. That means that we must be as careful of our brother's reputation as we would be of our own. When we are about to repeat some thing to the detriment of any one, stop and consider whether we would like to have him repeat such a thing about us. If this rule were followed, it would shut out a great amount of gossip and slander.*SITI December 3, 1885, page 729.17*

For there is such a thing as going to extremes. There are proper times to speak about another, even to tell things that are to his detriment. In a court of law, a man must witness to the truth, that justice may be done. So, also, the proper authorities in the church are to be notified when a brother persists in wrong-doing. This is in the interest of good order and discipline. The Bible says: "Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thine heart; thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbor, and not suffer sin upon him." *Leviticus 19:17*. He who covers up wrong in another, neither trying to restore him nor informing those who could restore him, becomes a "partaker of other men's sins." Here is another specification:-*SITI December 3, 1885, page 729.18*

"In whose eyes a vile person is contemned; but he honoreth them

that fear the Lord.” This does not mean that we are to despise and shun sinners, nor that we are to be uncivil to anybody. We are to show “all meekness unto all men” (*Titus 3:2*), and we are to be like Christ, who came to save that which was lost. While he hated sin, he was the sinner’s friend, and he sought their society, not for the sake of their society, but that he might do them good. But a “vile person,” a reprobate, is not to be esteemed. Remember that the text does not discriminate. It does not say that you must despise a vile person if he is poor, but that you may honor a reprobate who is wealthy. That is the way of the world, but it is not the Lord’s way. If society would adopt as a rule the fourth verse of this psalm, it would very soon be purged of a terrible load of corruption. *SITI December 3, 1885, page 729.19*

“But he honoreth them that fear the Lord.” One of the special requirements of an elder is that he be “a lover of good men” (*Titus 1:8*); and one of the sins charged against the people of the last days is that they are “despisers of those that are good.” *2 Timothy 3:3*. There is to be no discrimination; the poorest and most ignorant man, if he is a God-fearing man, is worthy of more honor than the profligate prince or millionaire. There is no honor that a man can receive that will outrank the honor which God gives, in imparting his grace to the humble. “Thus saith the Lord, Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might, let not the rich man glory in his riches; but let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me, that I am the Lord which exercise lovingkindness, judgment, and righteousness, in the earth: for in these things I delight, saith the Lord.” *Jeremiah 9:23, 24. SITI December 3, 1885, page 730.1*

“He that putteth not out his money to usury, nor taketh reward against the innocent.” By comparing this text with *Exodus 22:25; Leviticus 23:35-37; Deuteronomy 23:19, 20*, we see that the entire prohibition of taking usury was only from brethren; from strangers it was allowable to receive usury. This was no injustice; for extortion or unjust gain is expressly condemned everywhere. We are commanded to do good to all men as we have opportunity, but “especially unto them who are of the household of faith.” *Galatians 6:10*. It is just for a man to receive reasonable compensation for means which represents his own labor; still the Bible clearly

teaches that a man must not be a taker of usury, that is, that must not be his business. It is almost impossible for a man to engage in the business of money lending without taking advantage of the necessities of others, and thus violating the command to love his neighbor as himself. This is why we are positively forbidden to exact usury from the poor. "But they that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition." *1 Timothy 6:9. SITI December 3, 1885, page 730.2*

"He that doeth these things shall never be moved." Let a person live fully up to the 15th psalm, and he will surely have eternal life. He who does so, will be a perfect man; he will fulfill all the law. "Why," says the objector, "you don't take Christ into the account of all." Not so fast. We said that the one who should carry out the regulations laid down in psalm 15 would have eternal life, and in so saying we only echoed the words of the inspired writer. But who can fulfill them? Says Christ, "Without me ye can do nothing." *John 15:5*. The unrenewed man would find it an utter impossibility to do what is required. Even his best endeavors would come so far short of the standard as to sink him into perdition. *SITI December 3, 1885, page 730.3*

More than this, supposing that it were possible for a man to do in his own strength what is required; where could the person be found who has ever come anywhere near the standard? With the exception of Christ, no such person ever lived on earth. Then how much profit could one derive from his future good deeds, even if he could perform them? Not a particle. The blood of Jesus Christ, and that alone, can cleanse from sin. He whose sins are forgiven is a new creature in Christ, and it is not till then that he can perform works that are acceptable to God. "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." *Ephesians 2:8-10*. E. J. W. *SITI December 3, 1885, page 730.4*

December 10, 1885

“Sabbath-School Notes” *The Signs of the Times*, 11, 47.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—JAN. 2

No Authorcode

Sabbath-School Notes

The lesson for this week is a continuation of the recapitulation begun last week, and we know not how to present it better than to give the lesson entire, with our comments in the form of answers to the several questions. *SITI December 10, 1885, page 742.1*

1. During the period covered by the kingdoms of Babylon, Medo-Persia and Grecia, what form of religious worship prevailed? *SITI December 10, 1885, page 742.2*

Paganism was the prevailing religion, not only from the rise of the kingdom of Babylon, but from the fall of Adam. The worship of idols soon almost entirely displaced the worship of God, so that the light of truth was at times wholly obscured. The moral condition of the world under heathenism is very briefly and delicately described by Paul in *Romans 1:22-32; Ephesians 4:17-19; 5:11, 12.* *SITI December 10, 1885, page 742.3*

2. What name is given to this form of religion in *Daniel 8:11-13*? *SITI December 10, 1885, page 742.4*

Paganism is referred to in *Daniel 8:11-13* by the term “the daily,” not “the daily sacrifices,” but “the daily desolation.” The term “daily” or “continual” is aptly applied to it, since it was for ages the continual form of worship. *SITI December 10, 1885, page 742.5*

3. How long did this religion prevail after Rome became

supreme?*SITI December 10, 1885, page 742.6*

For about five hundred years after Rome acquired universal dominion, paganism continued to be the prevailing religion. In Constantine's time (A.D. 311-337) it ceased to be *the* religion of the empire; but it did not wholly lose its place as the State religion until about two hundred years later.*SITI December 10, 1885, page 742.7*

4. What religion then gained the ascendancy?*SITI December 10, 1885, page 742.8*

5. Who was the first Roman emperor that favored the Christian religion?*SITI December 10, 1885, page 742.9*

6. When did this emperor reign?*SITI December 10, 1885, page 742.10*

Those three questions we answer together, for the sake of convenience. The Christian religion was that which superseded paganism in the Roman world. When we say "the Christian religion," we do not mean the Christian religion as we find it portrayed in the gospels, but a corrupted form of Christianity. "Pure religion and undefiled before God," has never met with general acceptance in this world, and will never be the *prevailing* religion until sin and sinners are destroyed, and the new heavens and new earth appear, "wherein dwelleth righteousness."*SITI December 10, 1885, page 742.11*

Constantine is properly styled "the first Christian emperor." He began to reign in a subordinate position in A.D. 306; in 311 A.D. he became sole emperor of Western Rome, and it is from this time that his conversion to Christianity is dated; ten years later, in 323 A.D., he became sole emperor of the Roman Empire, or of the world. He died in A.D. 337. For a brief but vivid view of his life, see "Encyclopaedia Britannica," art. "Constantine." When we say that he nominally accepted Christianity in A.D. 311, we have said all that can be said. Conceive of an autocrat with the vices of a heathen ruler and the name of a Christian, and you have a picture of "the first Christian emperor." The following extract is a fair picture:*SITI December 10, 1885, page 742.12*

“The sublime theory of the gospel had made a much fainter impression on the heart than on the understanding of Constantine himself. He pursued the great object of his ambition through the dark and bloody paths of war and policy; and after the victory, he abandoned himself, without moderation, to the abuse of his fortune. Instead of asserting his just superiority above the imperfect heroism and profane philosophy of Trajan and the Antonines, the mature age of Constantine forfeited the reputation which he had acquired in his youth. As he gradually advanced in knowledge of truth, he proportionately declined in the practice of virtue; and the same year of his reign in which he convened the council of Nice [A.D. 325], was polluted by the execution, or rather murder, of his eldest son.”-*Decline and Fall*, chap. 20, par. 17.*SITI December 10, 1885, page 742.13*

7. How did he try to make the Christian religion popular?*SITI December 10, 1885, page 742.14*

8. How did he cause unprincipled men to profess to be Christians, when they were really heathen at heart?*SITI December 10, 1885, page 742.15*

The mere fact that the emperor professed Christianity would tend to make it popular; but the form which would be popular can be imagined by the character of Constantine, and the means which he used to propagate his religion, which are described by the historian as follows:*SITI December 10, 1885, page 742.16*

“By the edicts of toleration, he removed the temporal disadvantages which had hitherto retarded the progress of Christianity; and its active and numerous ministers received a free permission, a liberal encouragement, to recommend the salutary truths of revelation by every argument which could affect the reason or piety of mankind. The exact balance of the two religions continued but a moment; and the piercing eye of ambition and avarice soon discovered that the profession of Christianity might contribute to the interest of the present as well as of a future life. The hopes of wealth and honors, the example of an emperor, his exhortations, his irresistible smiles, diffused conviction among the venal and obsequious crowds which usually fill the apartments of a palace. The cities which signalized a

forward zeal by the voluntary destruction of their temples, were distinguished by municipal privileges, and rewarded with popular donations; and the new capital of the East gloried in the singular advantage that Constantinople was never profaned by the worship of idols. As the lower ranks of society are governed by imitation, the conversion of those who possessed any eminence of birth, or power, or of riches, was soon followed by dependent multitudes. The salvation of the common people was purchased at an easy rate, if it be true that in one year twelve thousand men were baptized at Rome, besides a proportionable number of woman and children, and that a white garment with twenty pieces of gold, had been promised by the emperor of every convert.”-*Decline and Fall*, chap. 20, par. 18.*SITI December 10, 1885, page 742.17*

9. How was the church affected by such a course?*SITI December 10, 1885, page 742.18*

As might be expected when men by the thousands gave a nominal assent to Christianity without the slightest knowledge of its spirit, the church speedily became very corrupt. Mosheim, the learned church historian, says that in the second century “a large part of the Christian observances and institutions” “had the aspect of heathen mysteries.”-*Eccl. Hist., Book 1, century 2, part 2, chap. 4, sec. 5* If this was the case in the second century, how much more would it be true in the fifth? In describing the church after Constantine’s “conversion,” Mosheim says:-*SITI December 10, 1885, page 742.19*

“Genuine piety was supplanted by a long train of superstitious observances, which originated partly from opinions inconsiderately embraced, partly from a preposterous disposition to adopt profane rites and combined them with Christian worship, and partly from the natural predilection of mankind in general for a splendid and ostentatious religion.... Further, the public supplications by which the pagans were accustomed to appease their gods, were borrowed from them, and were celebrated in many places with great pomp. To the temples, to water consecrated in due form, and to the images of holy men, the same efficacy was ascribed and the same privileges assigned as had been attributed to the pagan temples, statues, and lustrations before the advent of Christ. Images, indeed, were as yet but rare, and statues did not exist. And

shameful as it may appear, it is beyond all doubt that the worship of the martyrs-with no bad intentions indeed, yet to the great injury of the Christian cause-was modeled by degrees into conformity with the worship which the pagans had in former times paid to their gods. From these specimens, the intelligent reader will be able to conceive how much injury resulted to Christianity from the peace and repose procured by Constantine, and from an indiscreet eagerness to allure the pagans to embrace this religion.”-*Eccl. Hist., Book 2, cent. 4, part 2, chap. 3, sec. 2.**SITI December 10, 1885, page 742.20*

10. What disgraceful course was taken about the middle of the fifth century by several of the leading bishops?*SITI December 10, 1885, page 742.21*

11. How was this question decided in A.D. 533?*SITI December 10, 1885, page 742.22*

12. When and how was the supremacy of the bishop of Rome fully established?*SITI December 10, 1885, page 742.23*

During the fifth century there was a great contest among the leading bishops of the churches, each struggling for the supremacy. Among the most active in this disgraceful strife were the bishops of Rome, Constantinople, Antioch, and Jerusalem. In A.D. 533, the matter was decided by a decree of the Emperor Justinian, declaring the pope of Rome to be head over all the churches. The three powers that opposed this decree were the three horns that were to be plucked up by the little horn of *Daniel 7*. The last of these was conquered in A.D. 538, and the great papal hierarchy was then established?*SITI December 10, 1885, page 742.24*

13. What is this papal religion called in *Daniel 8:13*?*SITI December 10, 1885, page 742.25*

It is justly styled “the *transgression* of desolation.”*SITI December 10, 1885, page 742.26*

14. How is pagan Rome symbolized in the seventh of Daniel?*SITI December 10, 1885, page 742.27*

15. How is papal Rome symbolized in the same chapter?*SITI December 10, 1885, page 742.28*

In the seventh of Daniel, pagan Rome is symbolized by the “dreadful and terrible” beast with ten horns (*verse 7*), and papal Rome is symbolized by the same beast after the “little horn” with the eyes of a man, and the mouth speaking great things, had arisen and plucked up three horns. The “little horn” itself represents the papacy.*SITI December 10, 1885, page 742.29*

16. What is meant by the terms “pagan Rome” and “papal Rome”?*SITI December 10, 1885, page 742.30*

“Pagan Rome” means Rome when idolatry was the prevailing religion; “papal Rome” applies to the same power after Christianity had nominally become the religion of the empire. The word “pagan” is from the Latin *pagus*, meaning a district, from which comes *paganus*, belonging to the country. Changes are made much more rapidly in cities than they are in the country or remote villages; and so it happened that for some time after Christianity had been accepted by the court of Constantine, and by the inhabitants of the larger cities, the people residing in the country still worshiped idols. Therefore those who worshiped idols received the appellation of “pagans.” This term was not used to designate the heathen until the first centuries of the Christian era. “Papal” is derived from *papa*, father, a name applied to the bishops of Rome, from whence comes also the name “pope.”*SITI December 10, 1885, page 742.31*

Lack of space makes it impossible for us to give the remaining questions with specific answers. Specimens of the “great words” which the Romish Church has spoken against the Most High have been given in the SIGNS in notes on previous lessons. We have also given quotations to show that the prediction that the little horn should “wear out the saints of the Most High,” has been fulfilled by the Roman Catholic Church. We have seen how its power was curtailed in 1798, at the close of the 1260 years (time and times and the dividing of time), and that its blasphemous pretensions have increased until the present time. This check that was put upon the papacy is represented in *Revelation 13:3* by the statement that one of the heads received a deadly wound. The prophet saw this deadly

wound healed, so that “all the world wondered after the beast.” This was partially fulfilled when Pius VII. was set in the papal chair, in place of the pope who had been deposed two years before. Its complete fulfillment, however, is yet future; for the prophet saw that the horn, “made war with the saints, and prevailed against them, until the Ancient of days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High; and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom.” *Daniel 7:21, 22*. A complete restoration to its former power yet awaits the papacy. But its triumphing will be short; for the Lord will soon come, and destroy “that wicked,” utterly consuming it (*Daniel 7:11; 2 Thessalonians 2:8*), and then “the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High.” *Daniel 7:27*. E. J. W. *SITI December 10, 1885, page 742*.³²

December 17, 1885

“The Everlasting Kingdom” *The Signs of the Times*, 11, 48.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—JAN. 9

No Authorcode

The Everlasting Kingdom

When is the everlasting kingdom to be set up?*SITI December 17, 1885, page 758.1*

“And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever.” *Daniel 2:44*. “In the days of *these* kings.” These words occur at the close of the interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar’s dream of the great image. The kings (kingdoms) referred to cannot refer to the four universal monarchies,—Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome,—because these follow in succession, and it would be impossible for one kingdom to be set up in the days of each of them. The expression can refer to nothing else than the kingdoms into which Rome was divided, and which are referred to in *Daniel 2:41*. This division was completed before the close of the fifth century A.D.*SITI December 17, 1885, page 758.2*

The expression, “in the days of *these* kings,” shows conclusively that in no sense was the kingdom of God set up at the time of Christ’s first advent. There was at that time only one kingdom—Rome—and it exercised universal dominion. There was then nothing to indicate that the proud empire would ever crumble into fragments. This fact alone is sufficient to show that the setting up of the kingdom was not in the days of Christ or his apostles.*SITI*

December 17, 1885, page 758.3

By what special symbol is it represented?*SITI December 17, 1885, page 758.4*

The verse above quoted says that the kingdom of the God of Heaven “shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms.” In the statement of the dream, *Daniel 2:31-35*, we are told that the stone which was cut out without hands, “smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay, and brake them to pieces,” and that “then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing-floors; and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them.” When we remember that these various metals represent the kingdoms of earth, which are to be broken in pieces and consumed by the kingdom of God, we know that in this prophecy, the kingdom of God is represented by the stone.*SITI December 17, 1885, page 758.5*

Where is the image to be smitten by this stone?*SITI December 17, 1885, page 758.6*

What part of the world’s temporal history is represented by the feet of the image?*SITI December 17, 1885, page 758.7*

“Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his *feet*.” *Daniel 2:34*. It is self-evident that the feet of the image represent the last portion of this world’s history, or, rather, of the history of nations on this earth. We say this is self-evident, because in the time represented by the feet, the image is to be totally demolished and consumed. After it is smitten, no place is to be found for its fragments, showing that from that time the nations of earth are to have no place in history. It is evident, then, that this smiting of the image on the feet is the thing to which the disciples referred when they asked Christ, “What shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?” *Matthew 24:3*.*SITI December 17, 1885, page 758.8*

Did either of the four great kingdoms utterly destroy, or exterminate, the kingdoms that ruled before it?*SITI December 17, 1885, page 758.9*

Repeat a scripture that seems to allude to this fact.*SITI December 17, 1885, page 758.10*

In speaking of the fourth and last beast, Daniel says: "I beheld even till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame." *Daniel 7:11*. But in direct contrast with this, he speaks of the three preceding beasts as follows: "As concerning the rest of the beasts, they had their dominion taken away; yet their lives were prolonged for a season and time." *Daniel 7:12*. This shows that none of the kingdoms are utterly destroyed until the last. When Cyrus conquered Babylon, the Medo-Persian kings began to rule over the territory and subjects over which the Babylonian kings had formerly ruled. It was the same way, also, when Alexander conquered the Persians. When one universal empire succeeded another, the world simply changed rulers. Had it been otherwise, the conqueror would not have had much dominion. The characteristics of the conquered nation modified to a great extent the nation which subdued it. This is plainly indicated in the symbol of the fourth kingdom, as seen by John (*Revelation 13:1-10*). That beast was like a leopard (third kingdom); its feet were as the feet of a bear (second kingdom); and its mouth as the mouth of a lion (first kingdom). Besides these characteristics, it had the seven heads and ten horns peculiar to Rome, and did the same work that is ascribed to the fourth beast of *Daniel 7*.*SITI December 17, 1885, page 758.11*

These facts of Scripture are in harmony with the statement in *Daniel 2*, that when the stone smites the image, the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold are all broken to pieces together. It is in the days of "these kings," the ten divisions of the Roman Empire, that the smiting is done, but the consequent destruction takes in all that remains of all the preceding kingdoms.*SITI December 17, 1885, page 758.12*

What is to be the effect of this smiting?*SITI December 17, 1885, page 758.13*

When will this utter destruction take place?*SITI December 17, 1885, page 758.14*

Daniel 2:34, 35, 44, which have already been quoted, answer

question 8. All earthly kingdoms are to be destroyed utterly, to make room for the everlasting kingdom of God. This smiting is many times referred to in the Bible. God, speaking through the prophet David, says to Christ: "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt *dash them in pieces* like a potter's vessel." *Psalm 2:8, 9.SITI December 17, 1885, page 758.15*

The prophet Habakkuk had a view of this terrible dashing to pieces of the nations, and he describes it thus: "The mountains saw thee, and they trembled: the overflowing of the water passed by; the deep uttered his voice, and lifted up his hands on high. The sun and moon stood still in their habitation; at the light of thine arrows they went, and at the shining of thy glittering spear. Thou didst march through the land in indignation, thou didst thresh the heathen in anger." *Habakkuk 2:10-12. Compare the last clause with Daniel 2:35.SITI December 17, 1885, page 758.16*

Isaiah also bears testimony similar to that given by David: "And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots; and the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, ... and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears; but with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth: and he shall *smite the earth* with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked." *Isaiah 11:1-4. Compare 2 Thessalonians 2:8.SITI December 17, 1885, page 758.17*

And lastly we read the graphic prophetic description given by John: "And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns; and he had a name written, that no man knew, but he himself. And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood: and his name is called The Word of God. And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean. And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; and he treadeth the winepress of the

fierceness and wrath of Almighty God.... And I saw the beast, and the kings of the earth, and their armies, gathered together to make war against him that sat on the horse, and against his army. And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him.... These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone. And the remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceeded out of his mouth: and all the fowls were filled with their flesh.” *Revelation 19:11-21. SITI December 17, 1885, page 758.18*

Let the reader carefully compare these texts, and he will be convinced that they refer to the same time to which Peter does, when he says: “But the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and *perdition of ungodly men.*” 2 *Peter 3:7*. And this is, in part, the fulfilling of the promise of Christ’s coming. *SITI December 17, 1885, page 758.19*

But the destruction of the wicked of earth is only a part of the work to be done. Habakkuk says, immediately following the words before quoted from him: “Thou wentest forth for the salvation of thy people, even for salvation with thine anointed.” Immediately following the statement quoted from Isaiah, is a description of a wonderful state of peace, closing with these words: “They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain; for *the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord*, as the waters cover the sea.” *Isaiah 11:9*. And this agrees with the statement in *Daniel 2:35*, that, after the destruction of the image, the stone, representing the kingdom of God, “became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth.” This shows conclusively that the kingdom of God is to be finally established on this earth; that it is to be as real and literal a kingdom as were the Babylonian, Medo-Persian, and Grecian; that it is not yet set up, because when it is set up it immediately consumes the kingdoms of earth; and that it is to be absolutely universal, because it is to fill *the whole earth*, and no place is to be found for any opposing power. *SITI December 17, 1885, page 758.20*

How will the earth itself be purified from the effects of sin and the curse? *SITI December 17, 1885, page 758.21*

"But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up." 2 *Peter* 3:10. That this results in the purification of the earth, is evident from *verse* 13: "Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." *SITI December 17, 1885, page 758.22*

How will all the righteous, both the dead and the living, escape this terrible destruction? *SITI December 17, 1885, page 758.23*

Habakkuk says that when the Lord brings these terrible judgments upon the earth, he goes forth for the salvation of his people. Since the preservation of his people is the object, they may fearlessly "abide under the shadow of the Almighty." Resting on the promise of Jehovah, that, "Because thou hast made, the Lord... thy habitation, there shall no evil befall thee, neither shall any plague come nigh thy dwelling" (*Psalms* 91:5-10), the righteous can sing: "God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble. Therefore will not we fear, though the earth be removed, and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea." *Psalms* 46:1, 2. *SITI December 17, 1885, page 758.24*

But the people of God are not to be left on the earth during the great conflagration which destroys the wicked and melts the elements. "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord." 1 *Thessalonians* 4:16, 17. As the trumpet sounds, the dead are raised incorruptible, and the living are likewise changed from mortal to immortal, "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye" (1 *Corinthians* 15:51, 52); so that when they go to be with Christ, and to inherit the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world (*Matthew* 25:34), they are equal unto the angels, for they cannot die any more. And thus is fulfilled the statement in *Daniel* 2:44: "And the kingdom shall not be left to other people." *SITI December 17, 1885, page 758.25*

Not forever are the people of God to remain away from this earth. Says John: "And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them; and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection." *Revelation 20:4, 5*. Here the first resurrection, the resurrection of the righteous, is brought to view, with the statement that a thousand years is to intervene between that and the resurrection of the wicked. During that time the earth is in a state of chaos, an abyss, as it was in the beginning. Isaiah describes it thus: "Behold, the Lord maketh the earth empty, and maketh it waste, and turneth it upside down, and scattereth abroad the inhabitants thereof." "The land shall be utterly emptied, and utterly spoiled; for the Lord hath spoken this word." *Isaiah 24:1, 3*. And Jeremiah says: "I beheld the earth, and, lo, it was without form, and void; and the heavens, and they had no light. I beheld the mountains, and, lo, they trembled, and all the hills moved lightly. I beheld, and, lo, there was no man, and all the birds of the heavens were fled. I beheld, and, lo, the fruitful place [was] a wilderness, and all the cities thereof were broken down at the presence of the Lord, and by his fierce anger. For thus hath the Lord said, The whole land shall be desolate; yet will I not make a full end." *Jeremiah 4:23-27*. *SITI December 17, 1885, page 759.1*

During this period of desolation, those who have had part in the first resurrection, upon whom the second death has no power (*Revelation 20:6*), are sitting on thrones of judgment (*Revelation 20:4*), judging the world and wicked angels. *1 Corinthians 6:1-3*. They are in the kingdom of God, because they are in the New Jerusalem, the capital of that kingdom. The gates of the "strong city" will have been opened, "that the righteous nation which keepeth the truth" might enter in. *Isaiah 26:1, 2*. At the close of the thousand years, when "the holy city, New Jerusalem," comes down "from God out of Heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband" (*Revelation 21:2*); the wicked dead are then raised, and the prophetic declaration is, that "they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the

beloved city; and fire came down from God out of Heaven, and devoured them." *Revelation 20:9*. *SITI December 17, 1885, page 759.2*

This devouring is the same as the destruction described in the nineteenth chapter, a portion of which has been quoted. It is the same as the casting of the tares into the fire, spoken of by Christ in *Matthew 13*; and when this has been done, "Then shall the kingdom shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." *SITI December 17, 1885, page 759.3*

Reader, would you be one of the happy subjects of that kingdom? If so, you must do the will of God, and that means that you must keep his holy law; for only "the righteous nation which keepeth the truth" shall have a place in that kingdom. "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." *Revelation 22:14*. E. J. W. *SITI December 17, 1885, page 759.4*

"Principles and Precepts" The Signs of the Times, 11, 48.

E. J. Waggoner

The word "law" is derived from the same root as the words "lie" and "lay," and primarily has the same meaning. "A law is that which is laid, set, or fixed, like statute, constitution, from Lat. *Statuere*."-*Webster*. And in harmony with this, the same authority gives as the first definition of the word "law," "a rule of order or conduct established by authority." It is a favorite saying with those who would make void the law of God while professing allegiance to his word, that the ten commandments are good, but that they are adapted only to fallen beings, and hence cannot bind angels nor redeemed saints, nor even people in this world who have been converted. Let us see how such a theory agrees with the definition of law. *SITI December 17, 1885, page 760.1*

We will suppose that the angels are free from law, and that redeemed saints are to have a like freedom. In that case there would be nothing "laid down" for their guidance-no rule or order of conduct established by authority. In fact, there would be no

authority, and each one would act independently of all the others. There would then exist in Heaven the same thing that would exist on earth if there were no law, namely, anarchy; for that means “without rule.” But “God is not the author of confusion,” and therefore such a state of things cannot exist in Heaven, and if not in Heaven, then of course not among the saints still on earth. The case may be stated thus: 1. When there is no law there is anarchy and confusion; there can be nothing else. 2. Confusion cannot exist among God’s people, whether in Heaven or on earth. 3. Therefore, the people of God are always and everywhere subject to his law.*SITI December 17, 1885, page 761.1*

Seeing that it will not do to claim that any beings are absolutely free from law, the enemies of the truth have invented a specious theory, with which, unfortunately, many firm believers in the law of God have been captivated. It is this: “The law,” they say, “as it exists in the ten commandments, is adapted only to fallen beings. These commandments hang on the two great principles of love to God and love to man, and it was these principles alone that existed before the fall, and these alone will be the law for the redeemed.” And some there are who claim that these *principles* are all the law there is now for Christians. We regard this theory as more dangerous than the one which claims that all law is abolished; for it is the same thing in reality, while it has the *appearance* of great deference to the truth of God. Let us examine it.*SITI December 17, 1885, page 761.2*

It is utterly impossible for anyone to be guided by an abstract principle. Certain principles may have a controlling influence on our lives, but they must be embodied in definite precepts. As an illustration, we will relate a portion of a conversation which we once had with a gentleman who claimed that Christians have nothing to do with the ten commandments. The question was asked him, Is there, then, nothing for Christians to do? *Answer*—“Yes, they must love the Lord.” Very good, but how are they to show that they love the Lord? *Answer*—“By doing what he tells them to do.” Well, what is it that contains specific statements of what the Lord requires us to do to show our love for him? *Answer*—“Young man, I am older than you are.” The reader will wonder, as we did, what bearing this had on the subject. It showed that the man saw that the only possible

answer was, "The law of God," an answer which would not agree with his theory, hence he chose to give none. But the illustration serves to show that principles, to be obeyed, must be embodied in precepts.*SITI December 17, 1885, page 761.3*

Says the beloved disciple: "This is the love of God, that we keep is commandments." *1 John 5:3*. So when we read that the first great commandment is, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind." (*Matthew 22:37*), we know that it means nothing more nor less than that it is our first and highest duty to keep, both in letter and in spirit, all those commandments which define our duty to God. In no other way can we show that we love him.*SITI December 17, 1885, page 761.4*

Suppose for a moment that a man were placed here on earth with nothing to serve as a rule of life except the statement that he must love God supremely and his neighbor as himself. He sets out with a firm determination to do his whole duty. But ere long he is found doing something which God abhors. We will suppose that he is adoring the sun and moon. When reproved for this, he might well reply, "I did not know that I was doing anything wrong; nothing was said to me about this matter. I had a feeling of love and gratitude to God, and did not know how to manifest it in any better way than by paying homage to the most glorious of his created works." By what law could the man be condemned? He could not justly be condemned, because the will of the Creator on that point had not been made known to him, and he could not reasonably be expected to know the will of God if it had not been revealed.*SITI December 17, 1885, page 761.5*

It will be seen by a very little consideration, that to put a man on the earth with nothing but a general command to love God, and at the same time to expect him to do nothing displeasing to God, would be to assume that the man had infinite wisdom. For God is infinite; and if a man, without being told, finds out what God requires, it can only be because he can comprehend infinity. But this is an impossibility. "Canst thou by searching find out God? canst thou find out the Almighty to perfection?" No indeed; the creature that could know the mind of God any further than it was directly revealed by him, has never existed.*SITI December 17, 1885, page 761.6*

Then since, as we have conclusively proved, there must be a law for all creatures, and since this law must be definitely expressed, and since, moreover, the whole duty of man is to love God above all things, and his neighbor as himself, we are shut up to the conclusion that the ten commandments always have been and always will be the rule of life for all created intelligences. In direct support of this, Solomon says, "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter; fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man." *Ecclesiastes 12:13*. This settles the matter, at least for the present time. John also says that the love of God is to keep his commandments; but it will be our duty to love God to all eternity; therefore it will always be our duty to keep the commandments of God. And it makes it no less a duty because it becomes our highest pleasure. To the natural man, duty is irksome; the object of making him a new creature in Christ, is that it may be a pleasure for him to do his duty. Paul says that God sent his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, thus condemning sin in the flesh, in order that the "righteousness [requirements] of the law might be fulfilled in us." *Romans 8:3, 4*. The object of the gospel is to make us like unto Christ, who said, "I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, thy law is within my heart." *Psalms 40:8*. *SITI December 17, 1885, page 761.7*

In addition to the above, we offer the words of the prayer which Christ has commanded us to pray to God: "Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in Heaven." *Matthew 6:10*. Now the will of God is his law. See *Romans 2:17, 18*; *Psalms 40:8*. We are taught by this prayer, then, that when the kingdom of God is established on this earth, God's law will be kept here even as it is now kept in Heaven. And David says by inspiration, that the angels that excel in strength "do his commandments, hearkening unto the voice of his word." *Psalms 103:20*. That is, they are anxious and delight to keep God's commandments. Duty is with them a pleasure. And when God's kingdom comes, we also, if permitted to become subjects of it, will delight to do God's will, and will keep all his commandments, of which "every one" "endureth forever." We shall then do perfectly what we now are (or should be) striving to do in spite of the weakness of the flesh. *SITI December 17, 1885, page 761.8*

This subject will be continued in another article, in which we shall

consider the objection that there are certain commandments of the Decalogue which angels or glorified saints could not violate if they wished to, and that therefore it is absurd to suppose that obedience to those commandments is required of them. E. J. W.*SITI December 17, 1885, page 761.9*

“The High-License Delusion” The Signs of the Times, 11, 48.

E. J. Waggoner

The following we find credited to the San Francisco *Alta*:-*SITI December 17, 1885, page 761.10*

“The only bulwark so far thrown up against the encroachment of prohibition is the high license. Prohibition has outlawed beer and wine in Maine, Vermont, Iowa, and Kansas. Wisconsin, with her great brewing interest, has only saved herself by adopting high license. Nebraska, with her enormous distilleries and breweries, has taken the same shelter. Southern States, like Georgia and Texas, have their feet upon the very threshold of prohibition. Will the dealers in California hear and heed in time?”*SITI December 17, 1885, page 761.11*

This wail does not sound much as though high license were the grand, desirable thing which many misguided temperance people imagine it to be. There is a large number of influential men in California who are earnestly striving for what they call “high license.” Will they hear and heed in time? or will they persist in throwing up this “bulwark against the encroachment of prohibition”?*SITI December 17, 1885, page 761.12*

The first thing to do in dealing with the liquor traffic is to determine its character Is it wholly good and beneficial? or are there some evils connected with it? or is it an unmixed evil? The first question will be universally answered in the negative. No one will claim that there are no dark features to the liquor traffic. Well, then, is it partly good? This must be answered in the affirmative, if it can be shown that the use of liquor has any tendency to make men better, or wiser, or more kind to their families, or wealthier, or that it in any way conduces to their real happiness. Not one of these things can

be claimed for it. On the contrary, it is brutalizing and degrading in its tendency; ignorance and poverty everywhere accompany it; and misery of every description is caused by it. The use of liquor is a promoter of vice in every form; and it is safe to say that more murders and suicides result from it than from all other causes combined. It cannot be denied that the use of alcoholic liquors is evil, and only evil, continually. *SITI December 17, 1885, page 761.13*

Now what about licensing a traffic that is so unmitigated an evil? What does the word "license" mean? It means liberty. To license the sale of liquor, is to give men full liberty to dispense that which will entail all the evils above enumerated, and thousands more. Why not with just as good reason license murder outright? It will be claimed, of course, that those who sell liquor do not murder anybody. No, they do not directly; but it is well known that what they sell cannot possibly produce any good results, and tends directly to all manner of evil. An apologist will doubtless say that we do not prohibit the sale of fire-arms, and men often buy them with the sole design of committing murder. The case is not a parallel one; for weapons may be, and most commonly are, used for inoffensive purposes. If it were impossible to use them for any other purpose than that of murder, we think there would be a quite general demand for the prohibition of their sale. As it is, we are not championing the sale of fire-arms. Even if fire-arms were also an unmitigated evil, the question of their sale would have no bearing on the liquor traffic; for the existence of one evil is no just reason for the existence of another. *SITI December 17, 1885, page 761.14*

But the friends of license say we must not consider it as a *permission*, but as a *tax*. That is a distinction with no difference. We must consider it just as it is. A liquor license is simply a permission to certain men to sell that which will ruin their fellows, but with the provision that the profits of the unholy traffic are to be divided with the Government. And so, in spite of all casuistry, it is a fact that the Government becomes a partner in crime. *SITI December 17, 1885, page 761.15*

Whether any kind of license will serve as a step toward temperance, may be easily determined by a moment's thought.

People who are addicted to the use of liquor will get it if it is to be had. Then, if the license tax be placed so high that the small dealers cannot afford to continue the business, the result will be that instead of having a given quantity of liquor sold by one hundred dealers, we shall have the same quantity sold by seventy-five or less. But since these have to pay a heavier tax than before, they will make greater efforts to increase the profits, either by increased sales, or by adulterating the liquor still more, so that nothing is gained in the way of temperance.*SITI December 17, 1885, page 761.16*

The great argument which misguided temperance men urge in support of high license, is that public sentiment is not ready for prohibition, but that high license can be carried, and therefore we must take when we can get. True, and if they would lower the price of the license, they could carry their measure by a still greater majority. The question to be considered is not, What measure will secure the largest support? but, What measure is best? Let the latter question be settled, and then work for the support of what is right.*SITI December 17, 1885, page 761.17*

“But it is impossible to stop the sale of liquor entirely, even by the most stringent prohibitory laws; therefore the best thing to do is to secure as much revenue from it as we can.” This is another argument often used, but it is very fallacious. There are places where the sale of liquor is absolutely prohibited, and what has been done may be done. It is true that in large cities it is next to impossible to eradicate the evil; but the same thing may be said of all crime. We have a prohibitory law against murder, with severe penalties attached; but it has never been effectual in causing murders to cease. In our large cities the law is violated daily; yet no one thinks of licensing the evil. It is very certain that there are far fewer murders than there would be if there were no prohibitory law against murder; and no one can doubt that if the law were abolished, and any form of license substituted, murder would be rampant.*SITI December 17, 1885, page 761.18*

When the question of the resumption of specie payments was under discussion, a prominent statesman solved the problem by saying, “The way to resume is to resume.” So the way to prohibit is

to prohibit. It is true that it would take more time and a greater effort to secure prohibition than it would to secure even a very high license; but when secured something would be accomplished. Nothing is ever gained by parleying and compromising with evil. Vigorous measures alone are of any value, whatever the evil against which we are striving. We are firm in the belief that absolute prohibition is what all temperance people should labor for, no matter how impossible it may seem to secure such a result. The extract quoted at the beginning of this article, followed as it was by the statement, "We are opposed to prohibition," should open the eyes of temperance people who are courting "high" license. We do not doubt that license is a practical measure, but we have no faith in the results of such practice. It would not be so difficult a matter to secure prohibition as it seems, if men were in earnest. But whether difficult or not, makes no difference. We are not to abandon a good measure for a bad one simply because the bad one may be more easily executed. What we consider the proper method to adopt to secure prohibition may be discussed at another time. E. J. W.*SITI*
December 17, 1885, page 762.1

December 24, 1885

“The Law of God-for Whom Made” *The Signs of the Times*, 11, 49.

E. J. Waggoner

Last week, under the head of “Principles and Precepts,” we showed that not simply the great principles of love, but the embodiment of those principles in the ten commandments, are the rule of life for all men in all ages; that the law is adapted to pure and holy beings, and is kept even by the angels in Heaven. After one additional thought on this point, we shall proceed to notice in detail some things that are offered as objections to this view. *SITI December 24, 1885, page 777.1*

The difference between sinful man and the law of God, is shown by Paul in the following words: “For we know that the law is spiritual; but I am carnal, sold under sin.” *Romans 7:14*. Between things spiritual and things carnal there is no possibility for the slightest union, as is proved by *Galatians 5:17*: “For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other.” And therefore, as a consequence of this implacable enmity, the words of Paul follow very naturally: “So that ye cannot do the things that ye would.” This last statement is made more emphatic in *Romans 8:7*: “The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.” *SITI December 24, 1885, page 777.2*

That by the term “law” Paul refers to the ten commandments, and not to certain abstract principles, is easily seen from *Romans 7:7* and *2:17-23*. The fact, then, is made plain that men cannot meet the requirements of the ten commandments, because the commandments are spiritual, and men are carnal. “They that are in the flesh cannot please God.” *Romans 8:8*. Now it is required of all men that they please God, and therefore the apostle proceeds to show how it may be done: “But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you.” *Romans 8:9*. A man in whom the Spirit of God dwells is certainly spiritual, and therefore just in harmony with the law of God, which is also spiritual. And so we see that instead of the law being adapted only to sinful

beings, it is especially adapted to the righteous; for they are the only ones who can continue in its requirements. It is the keeping of the ten commandments (which can be done only by those who are "in Christ") that makes men spiritual; when they cease to keep the law, they cease to be spiritual. *SITI December 24, 1885, page 777.3*

In supposed opposition to the position which we have taken, is *1 Timothy 1:9, 10*: "Knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers, for whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, for menstealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine." Whoever imagines that this text means that a righteous man is not under obligations to keep the law, has never read more than the first clause. Since the law is "made for" those who steal, lie, kill, commit adultery, blaspheme, etc., we should gather that it forbids all those things, and so it does. Then according to the common supposition, the righteous, for whom the law is *not* "made," are not prohibited from these practices! A necessary conclusion which is so absurd, shows plainly that the premises are wrong. *SITI December 24, 1885, page 777.4*

But if it is the duty of Christians to keep the law, how shall we understand Paul's statement that the law is "made" for the wicked, and not for the righteous? We can answer this question in no better way than by quoting a portion of Dr. Clarke's comment on *1 Timothy 1:9*:-*SITI December 24, 1885, page 777.5*

"He [the apostle] does not say that the law was not MADE for the righteous man; but *ou keoti*, it does not LIE against a righteous man, because he does not transgress against it; but it *lies against* the wicked; for such, as the apostle mentions, have broken it, and grievously too, and are condemned by it. The word *keittai*, *lies*, refers to the custom of writing laws on boards, and hanging them up in public places, within reach of every man, that they might be read by all; thus all would see against whom the law *lay*." *SITI December 24, 1885, page 777.6*

This is exactly in harmony with the primal meaning of the word

law,—"something laid,"—as given in the article last week. The law is "laid" for the benefit of all; it lies *against* the man who violates it, and crushes him if he persists in his disobedience; but it does not lie *against* the righteous, because they "walk in the law of the Lord." There is no opposition between them and the law; to them the law is indeed "the way of peace," because they delight in it. But let one of the righteous ones step out of this way, and that step will bring the law *against* him. *SITI December 24, 1885, page 777.7*

And now to the statement that Christians are in duty bound to keep the ten commandments, and that, in fact, that is the badge of their discipleship, we must add another statement which necessarily follows, namely, that this delightful duty will be theirs throughout eternity, just as it has been that of the angels ever since they were created. "Angels that excel in strength" do the commandments of God, "hearkening unto the voice of his word." *Psalms 103:20*. And when the kingdom of God is established upon earth, God's will (the ten commandments) will be done on earth even as it is now done in Heaven. *Matthew 6:10*. As long as the throne of God endures, the ten commandments will be the law by which God rules his vast Government, the foundation of his throne. E. J. W. *SITI December 24, 1885, page 777.8*

"How Does It Happen" The Signs of the Times, 11, 49.

E. J. Waggoner

When people for the first time hear or read the truth concerning the Sabbath, the nature of man, the coming of the Lord, and other Bible doctrines held by Seventh-day Adventists, they frequently ask, "If these things are so plainly taught in the Bible, why is it that they have not been taught by Bible students in past ages? Why is it that Luther, Calvin, Wesley, and other learned and pious theologians did not see these doctrines?" *SITI December 24, 1885, page 777.9*

A satisfactory answer to these questions may easily be given. We must consider the circumstances under which those men began their labors. We must remember that when the Reformation began, the Bible had been for several hundred years a proscribed book. The art of printing was unknown, and books were necessarily

copied by hand. This was a tedious process, and made it impossible for poor people to own them. Besides this, the only copies of the Bible in existence were in the original Greek and Hebrew, or in Latin; and when we remember that Greek and Hebrew were rarely taught, even in the universities, and that few learned men had any knowledge of those languages, Latin being the only language of educated people, we see that the number of people who could use the Bible, even had they possessed a copy, was very limited. Still further, when we remember that the few manuscript copies of the Bible that were in existence were the property of the Catholic Church, which had no interest in circulating them among the people, but on the contrary, kept these copies carefully concealed, we see that it was next to impossible for anybody to have any personal acquaintance with the word of God. Says D'Aubigne:-*SITI December 24, 1885, page 777.10*

"The priests having taken into their own hands the disposing [of] a salvation which belonged only to God, had thereby secured a sufficient hold on the respect of the people. What need had they [the priests] to study sacred learning? It was no longer their office to explain the Scriptures, but to grant letters of indulgence; and for the fulfilling of that ministry, it was unnecessary to have acquired any great learning. In country parts, says Wimpheling, they appointed as preachers poor wretches whom they had taken from beggary, and who had been cooks, musicians, huntsmen, stable-boys, and even worse.*SITI December 24, 1885, page 777.11*

"The superior clergy themselves were sunk in great ignorance. A bishop of Danfeldt congratulated himself on never having learned Greek or Hebrew. The monks asserted that all heresies arose from these languages, but especially from the Greek. 'Greek,' continued he, 'is a modern language but recently invented, and against which we must be upon our guard. As to Hebrew, my dear brethren, it is certain that whoever studies that immediately becomes a Jew.' ... Thomas Linacer, a learned and celebrated divine, had never read the New Testament. Drawing near his end (in 1524), he called for it, but quickly threw it from him with an oath because his eye had caught the words, 'But I say unto you, Swear not at all.' 'Either this is not the gospel,' said he, 'or we are not Christians.' Even the schools of theology in Paris did not scruple to declare before the

Parliament. 'There is an end of religion if the study of Hebrew and Greek is permitted.' *SITI December 24, 1885, page 777.12*

"If here and there among the clergy some learning existed, it was not in sacred literature. The Ciceronians of Italy affect great contempt for the Bible on account of its style. Men who arrogated to themselves the title of priests of Christ's church, translated the words of the Holy Ghost into the style of Virgil and of Horace to accommodate them to the ears of men of taste. The Cardinal Bemlo wrote always instead of 'the Holy Spirit,' 'the breath of the celestial zephyr;' for 'remission of sins' he substituted 'the pity of the manes and of the gods;' and instead of 'Christ the Son of God,' 'Minerva sprung from the brows of Jupiter.' Finding, one day, the respectable Sadoletus employed on the translation of the epistle to the Romans, 'Leave these childish productions,' said he, 'such puerilities do not become a sensible man.'" *SITI December 24, 1885, page 777.13*

It was only a few weeks ago that a Catholic priest in Montreal, speaking of the Protestant Bible, said to his congregation: "I want to be understood that the Church forbids you to read those Bibles. If you have any of them in your house, burn them; and if you do not want to burn them, bring them to me, and I will burn them." *SITI December 24, 1885, page 777.14*

It was amidst influences like these that the Reformation began. Luther was twenty years old before he had even seen a copy of the Bible. Now if any one wonders why he did not, in his lifetime, grasp all the truths which it contains, let him try an experiment: Let him give the Bible to a man who has never seen the book, and see how long it will take him to thoroughly understand it. Let the reader consider his own case, and see how great an understanding he has of the Bible; then remember that there can scarcely be a parallel to Luther's case nowadays, because the influence of the Bible is everywhere. The people who have never read it have met its teachings in books, or perhaps in sermons, or in their intercourse with other people. When we think of these things, instead of wondering that Luther did not understand more of the Bible, we are lost in astonishment that he was able to grasp so many of its truths as he did. *SITI December 24, 1885, page 777.15*

When we come to the time of Wesley, we find that he had a still better understanding of the Bible than Luther had. This was not because he was a more talented or a more devoted man than Luther, but because he had better advantages. He had the benefit of all of Luther's study and experience, as well as of that of many other learned men. And as we come down a hundred years later, to our own time, it is no egotism to say that we may have a deeper insight into the truths of the Bible than Wesley had, because we have the aid of his research, and that of Bible students since his time. It would indeed be a cause for shame to any intelligent Bible student if he did not profit by the light thrown upon the word by those men of God. Besides this, we must remember that there are special truths for special occasions. Peter speaks of the "present truth." There is such a truth for every age. The special truth for the time of Luther was justification by faith. The people were swallowed up in dead forms and useless ceremonies, and needed instruction in the first principles of the gospel, of which the world was totally ignorant. All the preaching needed to be directed to that one thing. As the Bible became a common book, and the doctrine of justification by faith and not by works was more generally understood, other points could be brought in. As we come down to the early portion of this century, we see a special prominence given to the doctrine of Christ's second coming. Ministers of all denominations seemed moved by a common impulse to study the prophecies, and to teach them to the people. A little later the doctrine of eternal life only in Christ, and that received at the resurrection, began to be preached quite extensively. This was a natural consequence of the preaching of the second advent. And still later we find special attention given to the law of God, and the Sabbath, until now the truth on this point has been circulated throughout the world. To be sure, there have been a few people in all generations who have held all, or nearly all, of these truths; but the attention of the people as a whole has been directed to only one new truth at a time. *SITI December 24, 1885, page 777.16*

Our Lord, in speaking to his disciples, recognized the fact that the human mind must be led into truth step by step when he said: "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." *John 16:12*. It will be noticed, however, that while in different generations one truth has been made especially prominent, the

truths which have been brought out in preceding generations are not ignored, but the new truths are added to them; and thus is fulfilled the statement that “the path of the just is as the shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day.” *Proverbs 4:18.SITI December 24, 1885, page 778.1*

It is not for us to spend time wondering why former generations did not have certain doctrines preached to them, but simply to inquire, Are these things so? This may be easily determined by the Bible, and we should, instead of questioning, rejoice that new light is given to us, and should walk in the light while we have the light, lest darkness come upon us. E. J. W.*SITI December 24, 1885, page 778.2*

